Transubstantiation

A peculiar

ARTICLE

OF THE

Roman Catholick Faith,

Which was never own'd by the

Ancient Church

Or any of the

Reform'd CHURCHES.

In Answer to a late DISCOURSE call'd,

Reasons for Abrogating the

TEST.

By — Goodwin.

LIBRARY OF THE
UNION
THEOLOGICAL
SEMINARY
NEW YORK

LONDON,
Printed in the Year. 1688.

LIBRARY OF THE
UNION
THEOLOGICAL
SEMINARY
NEW YORK

THE PREFACE TO THE READER.

I Am very unfit to enter a Conteſt of ſo high a Nature, with a Perſon, who is infinitely my Superior in all ſorts of Learning, that nothing can excuſe the Attempt from being cenſur'd as Vanity or Preſumption, but the cauſe of Wrong'd Truth, which all have indiſpenſable Obligations to Vindicate. Every thing elſe, but the Injury offer'd up to that, pleas'd me in the Biſhop of Oxfords *Diſcourſe, who as he is a known Maſter of Language, Writes nothing but what is* Polite, *and Fine, and adorns that Learning which he poſſeſſes in a high degree, with all the charming Beauties of Eloquence. I hope I have preſerv'd for him that Reſpect, which I owe to his Dignity, as well as to his Worth. If any thing made me forget my ſelf, and him, it was ſome little Indignation, to read with what* Contempt *he treated two* Perſons, *for whom I have deſervedly a high Veneration. This rais'd ſome Spleen, which made me ſmile a little in Diſdain; and if then there hath dropt an unbecoming word, the Humour I was in, pleads for my* Pardon.

Perhaps now thou expecteſt ſome wiſe and weighty Anſwer unto the Reaſons for Abrogating the TEST; But

it becomes not me to Judge of what are Affairs of the State; and therefore I wholly wav'd that Consideration. Wherein our common Reform'd Religion is concern'd, there I have Interested my self, and as it hath been Attaqu'd in two several places, 'tis only the first I have now stood to Guard; The other part, which is to Maintain the charge of Idolatry against the Worship of the Roman Church, *may make me venture a second time, if some abler Pen than mine, is not provok'd to draw in the Quarrel. And now all the Favour I ask of thee, as some Recompence for so much Time which I have spent to give thee an houre Entertainment, is, that thou wouldest not enquire after the Name of a Man, who is very Inconsiderable; and who besides, assures thee, that it will be in vain, since he hath us'd sufficient care and precaution, never to be known.*

Tranſubſtantiation

A peculiar

ARTICLE

OF THE

Roman Catholick Faith,

In Anſwer to a late DISCOURSE call'd,

Reaſons for Abrogating the TEST.

I Have ſo little ambition to appear in any of the Diſputes, which have created ſo many quarrels among Chriſtians, as I wiſh with all my Soul, that they who are call'd by that glorious Name, perfectly agreed in thoſe Truths which were the Faith of the Apoſtles and the pureſt Ages of the Primitive Church. How Bleſſed would the Church of Chriſt have been in an undiſturb'd Peace, if all the Errors, which firſt corrupted our Religion, had been ſtifled in their Birth, and ſo never impos'd by the Canons of pretended Councils as Articles of our Creed. But Intereſt firſt ingag'd ſome Men to offer incredible things unto the People to be believed, and then took the firſt oppertunities to vent them in Times of ſuch Darkneſs, that the poor people were blind, and ſo eaſily miſlead; and to tye the Muffler about their Eyes ſo faſt, that it might never be unloos'd; the name of the *Catholick Church* was ſtill made uſe of to Authorize ſtrange Opinions

which she never own'd; and to secure her Authority from ever being question'd, the pretence of Infallibility was Impregnable. Now least any more Inquisitive, than the rest of the Head, should startle at the sight of what was new, and unseen before, the noise of Antiquity was sufficient to silence all their questions; and in an Ignorant Age, when few or none of those who were disinterested had wit enough to Judge of what was in present view, much less to look back with a discerning Eye on what was past at a far distance, the plausable story could not easily be disprov'd.

Thus the Worshiping of Images first stole out into the World, and not long after, the Doctrine of Christs Bodily Presence in the Sacrament, was Incourag'd to the Birth.

As long as People were dull enough to give an undoubted assent to all that their Priests told them, and were strongly prepar'd to swallow the hugest contradictions, they all went down smoothly; But as knowledg increas'd with the dawning of the Gospel, those gross absurdities were discover'd in many things, (which the People had believ'd without ever examining them, and which the darkness of preceding Ages had couceal'd) that it was necessary to give things a fairer appearance, to call them by softer names, that they might both look and sound less affrighting. This is the Artifice which is now so much us'd, and applauded by the Church of *Rome*, who it must be acknowledg'd, never wanted Address to disentagle her self, when her Errors are so expos'd, that they are no longer defensible; and then the surest way to avoid the blow, is to confound them with the contrary Truths, that her Doctrine may be as unknown as her own first Original. And indeed the best means to escape a Confutation, is to cast such a mist before our Eyes, as we cannot apprehend what it is she believes. In one Age, Transubstantiation is necessary to be believed to Salvation; now 'tis so indifferent, as 'tis disavow'd, that the Church ever appointed it an Article of Faith, or ever assign'd the Modus, (pardon a word which I have but borrow'd) of the Real Presence; and thus a point so dear, and which not Two Hundred years past, cost the Blood of so many Martyrs, because they would not own their belief of it, is vanished in the mists of the Schools, and utterly lost in the

the Duſt rais'd by the Diſputes of *Aquinas*, *Scotus*, and their Followers.

But the Author, who thus makes a new Creed for that Church, is too young a Proſelyte to Comment on the Articles of her Faith, and one ſo lately inſtituted into the Holy Rites, may with good reaſon have his deciſions ſuſpected, as not being grounded on a ſufficient knowledg in the Myſteries of her Religion.

I know not how thoſe who belong to that Communion will reſent it, but it hath a very odd Aſpect, that the Holy Catholick Church ſhould be drawn ſo, as to reſemble the Hereticks in the neareſt likeneſs as her Picture can be taken. It intrenches on her Infallibility, to reconcile the principal parts of her Doctrine with ſuch Articles as ſhe always condem'd of Hereſie; and which, as the moſt damnable Hereſie, ſhe hath continually and moſt fiercely oppos'd. It was for Tranſubſtantiation the great Heat began with *Luther*, though ſome other leſſer matters firſt rais'd a Quarrel. This in its niceſt Explications hath ſtill been the Subject of the warmeſt Diſputes. It was for this ſo many ſuffer'd as obſtinate Hereticks, not fit to live, becauſe they had liv'd too long to renounce the uſe of all their Senſes and Reaſon in believing an open contradiction to them all. And yet now the cauſe of ſo many Diſputes, Quarrels, and Blood, is cleverly convey'd away, and ſo many have flam'd at a Stake, and the ground been dyed with the Blood of ſlaughter'd Multitudes, only for ſome niceties of the Schools. For if we will truſt our Authors bare word, no Councils of the *Roman Church* have ever defin'd the manner of Chriſts Real Preſence in the Euchariſt, but left it to be wrangled out by Logicians and Sophiſters, as they could beſt clear it by the Principles of *Ariſtotle's* Philoſophy. Now it was the manner of that Preſence which always kindled both the Zeal of that Church, and the Fires which conſum'd Hereticks, who by conſequence ſuffer'd not as Apoſtates from the Faith, but the Doctrines of the Infallible Stagyrite. This is to make the *Roman* Religion moſt barbarouſly cruel, in Burning and Damning Men merely as Hereticks in Philoſophy; but tho thoſe who profeſs it are but little engag'd to him for repreſenting it ſo odious;

yet he has extraordinarily oblig'd all the Protestants, by creating them on a sudden true Sons of the Roman Catholick Church; we will now hope not only to be Sav'd our selves, but that all, who before us own'd the same Doctrine as we do, are in a very good condition, since he comprehends both us and them within her Bosome who appropriates to herself the Keys, and disposal of Heaven. We are all now of one Faith, and the Confessions of all the Protestant Churches exactly agree with the Decisions of the Great Council of *Trent*. They Assert the Real Presence, that Council, as our Author will have it, Determines no more; and how unreasonable then is it to make a Test to distinguish between *Roman* Catholicks and us, when we all believe the same thing. But however he boldly charges all the Wisdom and Authority of the Nation with a most rediculous Impertinence, in forming a Test for the *Roman* Catholicks, which does not concern any point of their Faith, yet Transubstantiation was once a very good Test for the Hereticks, and time was, when their saying in general Terms, that they believed the Real Presence, was not sufficient to save them from the Fire. There must certainly be something more in the business, which our Author would not see, and the reconciliation is too new, and easy not to be suspected, nor can I ever imagine that the Church of *Rome* will admit us into her Communion upon such facile conditions.

It will then be worth while to Enquire into the Reasons which led him into an Opinion, wherein he is alone, and which (for all that I know to the contrary,) he may always boast as peculiarly his own. What is the Ground of his Assertion which is altogether so Extraordinary? Why! Truly a harmless Word lay in his way, as he was hastily running through some Authors, at which he unfortunately stumbled.

It is very well known, that in most of the Books, that are written on this Subject, *Christ* is affirmed to be really present in the Bread, and Wine; and where ever our Author has met with this Real Presence, whether in the *Augustan*, or *Bohemian* Confessions; or in *Luther*, *Melancthon*, *Beza*, or *Calvin*, he fancy'd he saw the Body and Blood

of

of our Bleſſed *Saviour* in its full and true Proportion. This Fancy of his own, he hopes to perſwade others to believe, though all the Arguments he urges, is only by playing with an Ambiguity impos'd on an honeſt plain-meaning Word.

To unravel therefore that confus'd heap of Citations, which ſwell up ſo many Pages, it will be neceſſary to Explain

1. In what Senſe our great Redeemer is preſent to us in the Sacrament.

2. And then Secondly, It will be apparent, that all the Fathers of the Primitive Church, and all the Writers of latter Ages, till the Eigth Century was almoſt run out, never drop'd a word that can tempt us to think that they believed *Chriſt* to be ſubſtantially preſent in the Sacrament; However, they frequently may aſſert, That he is really preſent, and exhibited to our Souls in the Elements of Bread and Wine: So far were they from confounding the Real Preſence with the Subſtantial, of *Chriſt*'s Body in its natural way of Exiſtence, as our Author does.

And in the Hiſtory, which by his Example I ſhall give, it will alſo be manifeſt, that the Opinion of the Subſtantial Preſence never entred into the *Weſtern Church*, till *Paſchaſius Robertus* firſt Invented it, who firſt made an Innovation in this Faith.

3. And then Thirdly, I ſhall prove that this New Opinion was at laſt adopted into the Faith of the Apoſtatiz'd Church of *Rome*, who in ſeveral Councils have not only confirmed it, but choſe the very Word *Tranſubſtantiation*, as moſt proper to expreſs it.

4. I will Evidence, that the Confeſſions of the *Proteſtant Churches*, who our Author Cites, and their Writers, both Forreign, and of the Church of *England*, though they expreſs their Faith of the Real Preſence, yet they mean it in a different Senſe, from that which is determined by the *Roman* Church.

Firſt, To clear it, that the Body and Blood of *Chriſt* may be Really preſent in the Bread and Wine, and yet not Subſtantially, an Enquiry will be needful into the End, for which our Bleſſed Lord appointed and commanded the Celebration of this

this Holy Myſtery; and if he is preſent to us in it, ſo as perfectly to ſatisfie the Deſign of his Inſtitution, his Body and Blood are there in the greateſt reality that can anſwer our *Saviour's* purpoſe, though not in their real Natures.

It was not to benefit our Bodies, but our Souls, that he Inſtituted this and all other Ordinances. He did not intend herein a Character of Honour to our Fleſhly part, in conferring a priviledge of handling him. How poor a favour would this be to any real purpoſes of our happineſs? If we could ſuppoſe that he ſtill lived among Men, ſo that we might not only touch his Sacred Body, but ſee it in the moſt Glorious appearance, which is more than the greateſt Viſionaries of the *Roman* Church will pretend, and quite contrary to what their Natural preſence of his Body in their Sacrament entertains them with, where they do not, nor ever did ſee it, but only the Bread and Wine. If *Chriſt* were thus in his Humane Nature, the Object of all our Senſes at once, what benefit in this particular ſhould we enjoy more than what the wickedeſt Wretch living would equally ſhare? We ſhould be no more bleſſed barely in this reſpect than the multitude who crowded upon him; Than *Judas*, who kiſſed and betrayed him; Than the Soldiers who crowned him with Thornes and cloathed him in the mock Robes of a King; Than that Ring of an Impious Rabble, who were Spectators of his being Crucified, and triumph'd in his Death. Nay, if we could renounce our Senſes and Reaſon ſo far as to believe his Body Naturally preſent in the Sacrament, and that we receiv'd the very Subſtance of it into ours, and we could really think that we did ſo uncouth a thing, as to eat it, when by ſight and taſte we eat Bread: Yet how vain would this be to any real end of our Salvation, when as the greateſt Villain, who has but a Mouth wide enough to take in the Conſecrated Wafer, is as well a Partaker of *Chriſt's* Body in this ſenſe, as the moſt Holy-diſpoſed Soul. Thus inſignificant would the Real ſubſtantial preſence of *Chriſt's* Body and Blood, in the Sacrament, be to us, ſince he hath told us himſelf too,

Joh. 6. 63. *That the Fleſh profiteth nothing:* And therefore, if we will believe him, on his own Word, we cannot imagine he offers himſelf in that way, unleſs we can think, that when he intended us the greateſt priviledge of his Goſpel, and which ſhould do

us

us the moſt good, he would order the matter ſo, as in effect it ſhould do us no good at all. We may then be ſure of this, that however otherwiſe he meant to be preſent to us in this holy Supper, he never deſign'd to be there Corporally, that we might put him in our Mouths; and I am very apt to think, that when he aſcended to Heaven, he never thought to remove thence again, only to be carried about the Streets and ſhewn.

Our *Saviour* then does not give his Body to nouriſh ours, nor pours out his Blood to be tranſfus'd into our Veins; both his Body and Blood are preſented to us in the Bread and Wine, to profit our Souls; and therefore the Preſence of them in thoſe Elements, muſt be ſuitable to ſuch Beings as our Spirits, and in a way proper to diſtribute into them, their Gracious Influences and Effects: It muſt be Real, but Spiritual; It is Spiritual, that is not Bodily; for what would that concern the benefit of our Souls, which are no more capable of a Corporeal good, than our Bodies can be nouriſh'd by the knowledge of things? It is Spiritual, that it may be ſuitable to the Operations of our Spirits, whoſe refin'd Nature makes the Subſtantial preſence of a thing unneceſſary to place it before them, and when I think of any Object, though paſt, or far diſtant, it is as really in the veiw of my mind, as what I ſee juſt at my Elbow.

The Body and Blood of *Chriſt* then, as repreſented in the Signs, the Bread and the Wine, are as really preſent to our Faith contemplating them, as any thing can be preſent to the acts of our Minds. And the outward ſigns themſelves are not more truly before our Eyes, than the things ſignifi'd are before our Thoughts, which upon the notice which the Sign gives, inſtantly view and conſider, what 'tis ordain'd to repreſent. And Faith, which acts the greateſt part in making us Partakers of the Genuine bleſſings of this Sacrament, hath in the Word of God this Office appointed to it, that it realizes, or makes preſent to us, things that are far diſtant. It is call'd *the Subſtance of Things hoped for, and the Evidence of Things not ſeen*; what is deſcry'd in a far Proſpect by our hopes, Faith brings ſo near, that it ſets them before us, as if we held them in our hands and ſolidly poſſeſs'd them. Heb. 11. 1.

And

And therefore *Christ's* Body and Blood, are not merely brought to our remembrance by the outward Signs, as Figures of them, but with them are deliver'd to us, to all the intents and purposes wherein they can do us good. Thus in receiving the Bread and Wine, we receive *Christ's* Body and Blood too, as far as they can be given into our possession; and *Christ* design'd them for us. We have all, for which that Body was broken, and his Blood pour'd out, the pardon of Sin, and Peace, and Reconciliation with an offended God, and his favour confirm'd to us. And therefore we really receive that Body and Blood, since we effectually receive them to all their gracious Ends. And what real Presence of them can we desire more? I am certain this is as much as can be truly beneficial to our Souls, and the Sacrament aims at nothing farther.

Nor are we to think that the blessed Effects only of *Christ's* Body and Blood are presented to us with the Elements, which *Christ* has therefore instituted in Signs and Seals of this unvaluable Gift: But all gracious Influences are communicated to us, our Grace increas'd, and spiritual Strength improv'd, and the heavenly Life supplyed with fresh force and vigour. This is the blessed Efficacy of *Christ's* Body and Blood, which as really are present in the Sacrament to nourish and sanctifie our Souls, as the Bread and Wine are to feed and refresh our Bodies.

Thus *Christ* is really present in the Sacrament, that is, Spiritually so unto our Souls in such a manner, as is most effectual to Influence and Bless them, and yet he is not there in his Natural Being. So that according to this Explication of it, there will be vast difference between his Real and Substantial Presence: And all the Authors which are Cited, as Asserting both; yet all they indeed express, is only this, That *Christ* is Truly and Really Present in the Sacrament: Which they might very well affirm in the Sense I have given, and yet never have a thought of his being Substantially there.

I could

I could not but wonder to find it affirm'd, with ſo great Aſſurance, and bold Appeal, to all *that are but ordinarily Converſant in Eccleſiaſtical Learning, That the Ancient Fathers from Age to Age, Aſſerted the Real and Subſtantial Preſence, in very high and Expreſſive Terms.* And yet all that is brought to prove it, is nothing but the bare mention of ſome *Greek* and *Latine* words, which are of a very general and doubtful Signification, and may be applyed to a hundred things ſooner than to what they are made to deſign. If it were in an Age like that of which *Eraſmus* gives ſo pleaſant a Character; That it was ſo devoutly Ignorant, as it was accounted a Hereſie to underſtand *Greek*; then no Man could know but theſe hard Words might be unanſwerable Arguments: but now the Senſe of them is eaſie enough to be found out, that they Import nothing to the preſent purpoſe, and that they do not at all mean the Real and Subſtantial Preſence, as the Author Tranſlates them.

Reaſons for Abrogating the *Teſt*, pag. 13. *1ſt. Ed.*

And as eaſie it is to clear the Ancient Fathers from what he would Impoſe on them; and to prove that they are ſo far from aſſerting the Real and Subſtantial Preſence in High and Expreſſive Terms, that there is not the leaſt Expreſſion in any of them to favour that Opinion. And though indeed they ſay that *Chriſt* is Really preſent in the Bread and Wine, and they phraſe it often in Magnificent and flouriſhing words; yet they mean it in the Sacramental and Spiritual ſenſe, not the Natural manner of Being.

It will be unneceſſary, after the great Volumes which have been writ to this purpoſe, to ſwell theſe few Sheets with numerous Citations: I ſhall only ſelect ſome few that will more nearly concern the preſent Debate.

If the Fathers call the Elements of Bread and Wine, the Types, or Figures, or Signs of *Chriſt*'s Body and Blood; it will unavoidably follow, that they never underſtood any other Real Preſence of them, than ſuch as is Attributed to the Thing ſignifi'd, when it is offer'd and exhibited to our Minds by the Sign which denotes it; and therefore are not Subſtantially there, but only in a clear and lively repreſentation to our

Faith. And yet nothing is more common in their Writings, than such Expressions, *Tertullian* against *Marcion*, speaks clearly to this purpose in so many words. [a] *That Jesus Christ made the Bread his Body, in saying, This is my Body; that is to say, the Figure of my Body. And* [b] *that our Lord put on the Bread, the Figure of his Body.* And St. *Augustin* calls it a Sign, in these words; [c] *Our Lord did not scruple to say, This is my Body, when he gave the Sign of his Body.*

Eusebius Bishop of *Cæsarea*, speaks plainly the same Language, such a Harmony was there, not only in their Faith, but their Tongues. [d] *He himself* (speaking of our Lord Jesus Christ) *deliver'd to his Disciples, the Symbols of the Divine Dispensation; Exhorting them to represent the Image of his Body.* And in what they were to do it, he explains at but two Lines distance. *He prescrib'd to them, that they should use the Bread as the Symbol of his Body.*

It will not be improper to add a Testimony to the same purpose out of the Liturgy of *St. Basil*, especially since the Author of the *Reasons, &c.* lays a great Weight on this Prayer us'd in the *Greek* form of Consecration. *Make this Bread the Precious Body of thy Christ; and that which is in this Cup, the Precious Blood of thy Christ*; which Words are taken out of the Liturgies of *St. Chrysostom* and *St. Basil.* And if they are, they must not be understood as he would have them, unless he will allow a great Contradiction in the Liturgy it self; where in the Prayer which the Priest makes just before the Consecration, there are these Words: *He left to us the Monuments of his Passion that Saves us, even these which by his Command, we now set before you.* And the same he calls after the Consecration, *The Antitypes of the Holy Body and Blood of Christ.* But how could the Bread and Wine be the Types, or Signs, or Images of *Christ's* Body and Blood, if they were chang'd into their Substance, and so became one and the same thing with them?

It will not be Improper to add one Testimony more, which coming from one of the *Popes*, carries with it the greater Authority, and must claim Credit on the score of Infallibility. It is *Gelasius*, who lived about the end of the Fifth Century, who

[a] *Tertullian, contra Marcionem, Lib.* 4. c. 40.

[b] *Ibid. L.* 3. c. 19.

[c] *Augustin contra Adimant.* c. 12. *Tom.* 6. *Oper. Fol.* 48. *Paris.* 1571.

[d] *Euseb. Demon. Evang. L.* 8. *p.* 380. *Ed. Paris.* 1628

Pag. 33.

Κατέλιπε ἡμῖν ὑπομνήματα τὰ σωτήρια αὐτοῦ πάθους ταῦτα. ἃ προτεθεικαμεν κατὰ τὰς αὐτοῦ ἐντολάς.

Τὰ ἀντίτυπα τοῦ ἁγίου σώματος καὶ αἵματος τοῦ Χριστοῦ.

who ſpeaks as like a rank Sacramentarian, as *Peter Martyr* or any of them all. *Certainly* (ſays he) *the Sacraments which we take of the Body and Blood of Chriſt are a Divine Thing, for which reaſon we by them are made partakers of a Divine Nature, and yet it ceaſeth not to be the Subſtance or Nature of Bread and Wine. And certainly the Image and likeneſs of Chriſt's Body and Blood are celebrated in the Action of theſe Myſteries.* Galaſius de duabus nat. in Chriſto in Bibloth. Patr. 2. Tom. 4. p. 522 Ed. 3. Bimi.

And theſe Inſtances are a ſure and ſufficient Evidence, that the Antient Fathers never appropriated any thing elſe to the *Bread* and Wine but to be ſigns of Chriſts *Body* and Blood, and therefore could underſtand no more Real Preſence than what agrees to a Thing as repreſented by its ſign.

And as to our Receiving that *Body*, and that Blood, together with the outward Elements, they meant no more by it, than that all the Heavenly Influences, Spiritual Bleſſings, and Effects of Chriſt's Body and Blood, are Communicated and confirm'd to us in this Sacrament, I will produce but two or three Witneſſes to prove it, and the firſt ſhall be *St. Cyprian*, who in his Diſcourſe of the Lords *Supper*, thus Expreſſeth himſelf. *An Immortal Nouriſhment is given different from common Food retaining the appearance of Corporal Subſtance, but by an Inviſible Efficacy manifeſting the preſence of the Divine Power.* And he farther explains his meaning in theſe words. *That common Bread chang'd into Fleſh and Blood, procures Life and Growth to our Bodies, and therefore by this uſual effect of things, the weakneſs of our Faith being help'd is taught by a ſenſible Argument, that the Effect of Eternal Life is in the viſible Sacraments.* Agreable to this is what *St. Au-* S. Cypria-nas de cœnâ Domini.

ſtin ſays in his Comment on the 98th P*ſalm*, where he introduces our Saviour to remove the offence which his Diſciples had taken at his Words in *John* 6. 53. thus ſpeaking to them, *you are not to eat this Body which you ſee, nor to drink that Blood, which thoſe who will Crucifie me, ſhall ſhed, I have commended a certain Sacrament to you, which Spiritually underſtood will give you Life.*

I will mention but two more, the firſt ſhall be St. *Ambroſe*, who ſpeaking of the Sacrament, hath theſe words. *The ſubſtance of the Bread is not taken away, but the Grace of the Body of Chriſt is ſuperadded to the Bread; and thence it hath the Name of that Body given to it.* By the grace of Chriſt's Body, nothing elſe can be meant, but all the gracious Effects and Bleſſings which are procur'd to us by his Death and Blood, and which the Bread and Wine exhibit and preſent to us.

Lib. 4 *de Sacramentis.*

The next ſhall be St. *Chryſoſtome*, who expreſly refutes our eating *Chriſt*'s Body in the Natural Subſtance of it. *Myſteries* (ſays he) *are not Carnally, but with our inward Eyes, that is Spiritually to be conſidered and contemplated, for this is the nature of Myſteries.* And a little after. *As in Baptiſm, by the ſenſible Element of Water, the intelligible gift of Regeneration is conferr'd? ſo this Intelligible gift of the Body and Blood of Chriſt, is not perceiv'd by any Corporeal, or Senſible Action, but by the ſpiritual underſtanding of Faith in the Soul and Mind.*

Homil. 45: *In S. Joh.*

Now

Now these Expressions are so clear, that the Sense of them may be discern'd at first sight, and therefore can more surely direct us to a full and plain understanding of the Mind of the Fathers, than Metaphors and Figures of Eloquence, or than general ambiguous Phrases, which may promiscuously be applyed to signifie an hundred different Things. It is indeed very well known, that they often express themselves in high and glorious Terms; but we are to reflect upon the fair occasion that they had to do so, and on what was their design. It was an Early and Just Complaint in the Church, that many of those who were admitted to the participation of this Holy Mystery, had too slight Thoughts of it, and did not approach it with a becoming Reverence. They had not an awful sense, and therefore receiv'd the Sacrament as if they eat only common Bread and Wine; The ordinary Entertainments of a Love-Feast, and the tyes of Christian Charity and Fellowship, for so was Eating together accounted among the Antients. Of this the Apostle gives us a large account in his first Epistle to the *Corinthians*, and grievously complains; and writes, not only with the greatest earnestness, but in the highest Language could be used, to alarm them with the danger of their stupid negligence. He therefore roundly tells them, that they were guilty of Profaneness towards the Body and Blood of Christ, and so eat and drunk Damnation, because they discern'd not the Lord's Body. *B*ecause they took the *B*read and Wine without regard to the sacred Institution, not looking on them as the Symbols which *Christ* had appointed to represent his *B*ody and his *B*lood, and so were guilty of neglecting them, because they did not by Faith

1 *Cor.* 11. *V.* 27, 28, 29.

Faith ſee them ſpiritually exhibited in the outward Signs. And to the ſame intent he ſpeaks ſo glorioufly of this Ordinance in the preceding Chapter, where he honours the *Bread* and Wine which went round the holy Aſſembly with no lower Title, than the Communion of the *Body* and *Blood* of *Chriſt*: That ſo they might not have ſuch poor Apprehenſions of this Bleſſed Feaſt, that in it they Eat and Drank together, only as the Bond and Token of Chriſtian Communion; but they ought to penetrate the receſſes of this Glorious Myſtery, and diſcern the Ineſtimable bleſſing unſeen and cover'd under it. They had not meerly Communion one with another in Aſſembling to Eat together, but they Communicated in the ſame *Body* of Chriſt, ſince all the Effects, Influences, and Efficacy of his Body and Blood was diſtributed with the Bread and Wine to every Holy Soul in the Aſſembly, who worthily receiv'd. Such high and magnificent words did the Apoſtle think neceſſary, which by applying all the Glory and Majeſty of the things ſignified to the Signs, might procure it due Veneration. By the ſame proportion we are to meaſure the intended meaning of the Fathers, when they ſay, that the *Bread* and Wine, are Chang'd, Transform'd, Tranſelemented, *&c.* into the *Body* and *Blood* of *Chriſt*. They thought they could not ſpeak too Loftily on this Subject, to advance its Dignity; and therefore employ'd all the Flouriſhes of Eloquence, of which they were great Maſters, to deſcribe it to the People in the moſt Glorious and Heavenly ſhape it could be drawn. They deſign'd to raiſe the thoughts of the Communicants, to conſider there was a great deal more in this ſolemn act of their Religion, than what was barely offer'd to their ſenſe; and

*Chap.*10.*v.*

and that the visible matter of the Sacrament was not vain and empty Signs, but as Instituted and Commanded by our Lord *Christ*, were follow'd with his *Blessings*, and accompanied with the Life and spirits of his *Body* and *Blood* to all gracious purposes.

And on this account, as our *Saviour* himself did not, so neither did they make any difficulty to Honour the *Bread* with the Name of his *Body*: Nay, sometimes in the heat and rapture of their Zeal, to inflame Peoples Affections, and warm their Devotions, they would use the most high and expressive Terms.

The *Greek* Fathers, those of Μεταβολὴ, Μεταρρύθμισις, Μετασκευασμὸς, Μεταποιησις, Μεταστοιχείωσις. And the *Latines* agreeable with the *Greeks*, Conversion, Transmutation, Transformation, Transfiguration, Transelementation, Transubstantiation onely excepted, which the Author of the Reasons, &c. puts in among the rest, and yet it is not to be found in any of the Ancients,) by all which they express'd nothing less than the Real and *Substantial* Presence in the Eucharist, unless he will fasten so Invidious a Character on the Fathers of the Church, as to accuse them of Writing against themselves. And contradict themselves they must, if those Words of

Reasons for Abrogating, *pag.* 13.

of theirs are Explain'd of the converſion of the ſubſtance of the *Bread*, (and any other change beſides *Subſtantial* will ſignifie nothing to the purpoſe) into the *Subſtance* of Chriſts *Body*. For nothing can be more contrary than ſuch a real Converſion to all their other Expreſſions concerning the *Supper* of our Lord, wherein they call the *Bread* and Wine, *Signs* and Figures of Chriſts *Body* and *Blood*; of which I have before given ſome few, when I might have Innumerable Inſtances.

But what though the Fathers never explain'd themſelves in any other than theſe Words, which the Author Aſſigns as a valid proof, that they believed the Real *Subſtantial* Preſence, yet from Words which are of ſo doubtful a ſound, no Argument can be form'd to make it good, unleſs it could be prov'd they were determin'd to ſignifie a change of *Subſtance*, and could Import nothing leſs. And for this I dare Appeal to him, or any other, to produce a *Sentence* out of any of the Fathers, or any other Authors of Fame for the Propriety of thoſe two Languages, wherein any of theſe Words are accepted in that peculiar meaning he is pleas'd to put upon them.

And

And yet I will give several Instances as well out of the Fathers, as prophane Writers, that these words are made use of to express such things, wherein it would be perfect Non-sense to understand any Change of their Being or Substance.

And first for the word Μεταβολὴ, if we may believe *Suidas*, it signifies in general all change whatever, as well in Quantity, Quality, and Place as Substance, and so may be indifferently us'd in respect of them all. And accordingly *Gregory Nyssen.* expresseth by it the Change that is wrought in us in Regeneration, and what passeth on us by Baptism, which no Man will say moulds us into a new Substance.

Suidas in voce μεταβολὴ.

Greg. Nyssen. Orat. Catech. Tom. 3. p. 108. Τὸ ἔτι ἀνακαινισμῶ καὶ τῇ μεταβολῇ τῆς φύσεως ἡμῶν τὴν σωτήριον παραλαμβάνεσθαι γένησιν παντὶ δῆλόν ἐστι & paulo post ἡ διὰ τοῦ βαπτίσματος πρὸς τὸ Κρεῖττον μεταβολὴ.

Nor will the next words serve his design more succefully. For μεταῤῥύθμισις, means no more than the Reformation, or Amendment of a thing. Thus *Xenophon* introduces the Master of a Family visiting his Servants in the several Employments in the Fields, and having diligently surveyed them all, says he, if I see any thing that I judg may be better done, I amend it. And in the same sense *Aristotle* uses the word, speaking of reclaiming the vicious from a lewd course of Life, who were acted only by Passion, or Pleasure, and such, says he, what Reason can correct or reform. And *Clemens Alexandrinus* when he says, *That Learning doth adorn and accomplish a Man by the Improvement of his Nature*, expresseth it by the same word. And yet all this is done without metamorphosing a Man into some other Creature.

Xenophon Oeconom. pag. 495. Ed. Gr. *H. Steph.* Μεταῤῥυθμίζω ἐὰν ἔχω τὶ βέλτιον, τοῦ παρόντος.

Arist. de Moribus. lib. 10. Tom. 3. Op. *pag.* 186. Ed. Duvallii, Τοὺς δὴ τοιούτους τίς ἂν λόγος μεταῤῥυθμίσαι.

Clemens Alexandr. Strom. lib. 4. *p.* 534. Ed. Paris 1629. Κὶ γὰρ ἡ διδαχὴ μεταῤῥυθμίζει τὸν ἄνθρωπον.

But let us try what the other μετασκευασμὸς will do for the cause. It properly signifies to make a thing change its place: But it is us'd by *Synesius* to express the alteration of a State, or course of Life, and yet a Man may pass from one place to another, or alter his way of living, and continue the same unchang'd in his Being, μεταποίησις signifies the Change of a thing too, but such

Synesius in Epist. *pag.* 58. Edit. Gr. Turnebi. Κάιτοι τις οὐκ οἶδεν ὅτι καὶ τοὺς φύσει στρατιοτικῶς ἔχοντας τῶν ἀρχόντων μεταδιδάσκουσι καὶ μετασκευάζουσιν εἰς ἐμπόσους. Synesius.

as may well be together with the sameness of it Substance. Since *Justin Martyr* makes this word to explain the Restoration of all things at the last day of the World, which yet he never could imagine would be turned into a new one for Substance. And *Gregory Nyssen.* has the same word to express the Change of our Life after Regeneration.

Justin Martyr Quæst. 1. ad Græcos. Θεὸς τὴν οὐρανὸν ἔταξε τῷ οἰκείῳ ὅσῳ ἐν ἀφθαρσίᾳ διαμένειν ἕως τοῦ καιροῦ τῆς τῶν ὄντων εἰς τὸ κρεῖττον μεταποιήσεως κατὰ τὴν πίστιν τῶν ὀρθοδόξων.

Greg. Nyssen. Orat. Catech. Tom. 3. *p.* 108. Ἡ διὰ τῆς ἀναγενήσεως γινομένη τῆς ζωῆς ἡμῖν μεταποίησις, οὐκ ἂν εἴη μεταποίησις εἰ ἐν ᾧ ἐσμεν διαμένοιμεν.

The great Contest is for the next word μηταστοιχείωσις, which according to *Suidas* is the turning of any thing into another Figure and Shape, and if we take this Signification of it from him, it will do very little good in the present case, since the most zealous Assertors of the real substantial Presence, were never yet abandon'd of Sense, as to say that the Figure of the Bread is chang'd into that of Christ's Body, since the Figure is one of the Accidents of the Bread and Wine, which they affirm to remain after the Consecration. But if we should suffer the word to be rendred as the Author pleases, to signify Transelementation, yet even thus it could never signify a Conversion of one Substance into another; unless he will say, that we are transubstantiated when our Natures are renewed by Grace: For *Cyril* of *Alexandria* expresses it by this word. And if *Gregory Nyssen*, and *Theophilact* use the term μεταστοιχείωσις with respect to the Bread and Wine, they must yet mean by it some other Change, than that of Substance. For it will hardly be acknowledg'd, that the Water in the other Sacraments of Baptism is transubstantiated, yet this Phrase μεταστοιχείωσις is as well brought in by *Cyril* of *Alexandria*, when he speaks of the Waters of Baptism, as it is by *Nyssen* and *Theophilact* in discoursing concerning the Bread and Wine in the Eucharist, and if it must express a substantial Conversion of the Elements in one Sacrament, with equal Reason it must import the same in the other. But if it is granted that all the Change of the Baptismal Water is only as to its designation to a holy Use and Blessing,

Suidas in voce μεταστοιχειοῦσα.

Cyril Alex. de Adorat. *lib.* 17. Ὁ (sc. Christus) πάντα πρὸς καινότητα μεταστοιχειῶν.

Cyril. Alexand. in Joh. 3. in Catenâ διὰ τῆς τοῦ πνεύματος ἐνεργείας τὸ αἰσθητὸν ὕδωρ πρὸς θείαν τίνα καὶ ἀπόῤῥητον Μεταστοιχείωσαι δύναμιν ἁγιάζει τε λοιπὸν τοὺς ἐν οἷς ἂν γένοιτο.

Bleſſing, then neither will there be any other alteration of the Sacramental Bread and Wine, than their being conſecrated to a peculiar and ſacred uſe, ſo that they are no longer common things, but hallowed by our Lord's Inſtitution.

So now all that can be inferr'd from theſe Greek Expreſſions is only this, That the Bread and Wine after the words of Bleſſing are pronounc'd are chang'd; but how? not into other Subſtances, but in reſpect of their Appointment to a ſolemn and ſacred Office. They were before the common Food of our Bodies, now they are the lively Signs of Chriſt's Body and Blood. Thus poor Fiſhermen were by God's peculiar deſignation turn'd into Apoſtles, and yet the Nature of Men continued in them the ſame.

For the ſame Reaſons the Latin words uſed by the Fathers who wrote in that Language *, will as little advantage the buſineſs of the real ſubſtantial Preſence, ſince their ſignification is as general and unreſtrained as the other. They mean ſome change indeed to be in the holy Materials of the Euchariſt; but it may be ſuch an one as I have aſſign'd, merely as to condition and uſage, ſince no other is determin'd by the ſenſe of the words as uſed in any Author.

* *Such as Converſion, Tranſmutation, Transformation, Transfiguration, Transelementation.*

So vain is it to argue from an uncertain ſound of words, which have a general unlimited ſenſe, ſince 'tis againſt all the Rules of Reaſon to fix a particular meaning on thoſe Expreſſions, which are delivered in general terms, and ſo may be underſtood many ways.

Indeed, if the Learned Author of the Reaſons, *&c.* could have employ'd the word μετασίωσις, it would have done excellent ſervice, ſince this perfectly deciphers a converſion of Subſtance, and exactly anſwers Tranſubſtantiation. But he very well knew, that the one is no more to be found among the Greek Fathers, than the other among the Latins. If all the Fathers, from Age to Age, aſſerted the Real and Subſtantial Preſence, in very high and expreſſive terms, as the Author ſays they did. How unluckily did they miſs this word μετασίωσις, which was moſt proper and full to have explain'd ſuch a meaning. The Church of *Rome* hath made ſufficient proviſion, that none

may doubt of Hers, by inventing a very high and expreſſive term indeed, Tranſubſtantiation, which I muſt confeſs, has a ſenſe particular, and very deciſive.

We are by this inform'd what was the belief of the Church in this Article till the fifth Century, and none preſum'd to remove this Foundation of their Faith, till the middle of the Seventh. *Ephrem* Patriarch of *Antioch*, who lived in the beginning of the Sixth; *Facundus* an *African* Biſhop, who flouriſh'd about the middle of the ſame Age; and *Iſidore* Biſhop of *Sevil* in *Spain*, who wrote in the firſt Years of the ſeventh Century, expreſſed themſelves, concerning the Euchariſt, exactly in the ſame manner as all the Fathers before them. *Ephrem* in a Diſcourſe againſt the *Eutychians*, (of which *Photius* hath given us an abſtract) to prove the Diſtinction of the two Natures in Chriſt, takes an Inſtance from the Bread in the Euchariſt, which he aſſerts to retain its proper Subſtance; and that the Body of Chriſt is preſent only to our Minds, and in reſpect of that Grace which is exhibited with the Signs. And accordingly he draws a compariſon between that Sacrament, and Baptiſm; which tho it is wholly Spiritual, yet preſerves the Property of its ſenſible Subſtance, the Water which looſeth nothing of what it was made.

Photius in Biblioth. p. 794. Ed. *Roth.* 1653.

Facundus ſays plainly, *That neither the Bread is properly Chriſt's Body, nor the Wine his Blood, but that they are called ſo, becauſe they contain in them the Myſtery of his Body and Blood.*

Facundus lib. 9. c. 5.

Iſidore ſpeaks as clearly to the ſame ſenſe, when he ſays, That *the Blood and the Wine are the two viſible Things in the Euchariſt, which being both of them ſanctified by the Holy Spirit, are turn'd into the Sacrament of the Divine Body.*

Iſidor. Hiſpal. de Offic. Eccleſ. lib. 1. cap. 18.

I might add a great many other, ſince there is no one Writer of theſe Ages, which explain'd their thoughts of the Real Preſence in any other terms. So conſtant and agreeing was the belief of the Church in this Article, till two Greek Monks began to expreſs it in different and ſuſpicious words.

The firſt, whoſe way of writing had any Aſpect looking toward the real ſubſtantial Preſence was *Anaſtaſius*, a Monk of Mount *Sinai*, He was the firſt who denied the Bread and Wine in the Sacrament, to be the Signs or

Types

Types of the Body and Blood of Christ, and affirm'd them to be the Things themselves. And he wrote about the middle of the seventh Century. *Anastas.* Sinaita in *Odegon*, cap. 23.

The other was a Monk of St. *Sabas* in *Palestine*, who lived in the Eighth. And the occasion of his receding from the Ancient Doctrine of the Church, and advancing this new Opinion, was the Contest which began in the Greek Church about the Worship of Images.

Leo Isauricus, who succeeded *Artemius*, or *Anastasius* the 2d, in the Throne of the Grecian Empire, by a publick Edict commanded, that Images should be broken down in all Churches; which was executed, tho not without some resistance from the superstition of the People. The two great Zealots, who inflam'd, and animated the fury of the Rabble against their Emperor, were *German* the Patriarch of *Constantinople*, and this Monk of the Monastery of St. *Sabas* in *Palestine*, who from his Grand-father had the Name of *Mansur*; but that by which he was then usually call'd, and by which he is now most known, is *John Damascene*, because he was of an Ancient and Illustrious Family in *Damascus*. He was very active in writing Circulatory Letters in defence of Images, to rekindle the mad Devotion of the People, and to excite them, in defiance unto their Prince's Order, to set them up again. Upon this followed horrible Confusions and Disorders in the Government; which to appease, the next Emperor *Constantine Copronymus* assembled a Council at *Constantinople*, who by their Decisions might quiet these Differences and Heats. wherein no less than 338 Bishops agreed, with one consent, to condemn Image-Worship, and to establish the true Faith concerning the Eucharist upon that occasion. It was of so many as 338 that Council consisted, as appears by the number recorded in the Decree of that Council, which is extant entire in the seventh Act of the second *Nicene*. Which great Number, tho the Annalist bewails as a dismal Sign of the Corruption and Apostacy of the Eastern Church, yet it was rather an Indication how pure the Faith had been hitherto preserv'd as to the Eucharist: since all these Fathers, with one Voice, not only determin'd the *Worship of Images to be a revival of the old Idolatry of the Heathens*; but they also defin'd the Sacrament

Baronii Annal. To. 9. ad Annum 727. pag. 86, & 90. Ed. *Plant.* 1612.

Baron. Ibid. ad Annum 754. pag. 221.

Baron. Ibid. ad Annum 787. pag. 402, 403. & cap. 5. Act. 7. Secundi Niceni Concilii in collect. Labbei Tom.

to

Baronius Annal. To. 9. ad Annum 787. pag. 402, 403. & cap. 5. Act. 6. Secundi Niceni Conc. in collect. Labbei Tom.

to be the proper Figure which Christ had given us of his Body. Because the most plausible Argument for the use of Images was, that Christ as Man might be represented; and so his picture being his Likeness, be reverenc'd. They declar'd, in answer to it, That *to describe the Person of Christ in a Picture, or a Statue, was either with* Nestorius *to divide his Humane Nature from his Divine, of which no Resemblance could be made; or else it would, as* Eutyches, *confound them together.* And farther, to shew how unnecessary and impertinent it was to frame an Image of Christ, they produced *the Eucharist as the true Image which himself had appointed, to represent his Body and his Blood to the exclusion of all other.*

They also particularly Excommunicated *Germain* the Patriarch, *George* Bishop of *Cyprus*, and *John Damascene*, which three had with great heat asserted the Adoration of Images. And the last of the three they mark'd with the black Character of *an Idolater, one injurious to Christ, and a Teacher of Impiety.* This was enough to make his Blood boil, and to alarm him unto a fierce opposition of the Councils Decrees against his Opinion; which he thought himself now as much obliged in Honour, as by Inclination to defend. To vindicate his dear espoused Cause, it was needful to remove the Objection which the Council had rais'd concerning the *Eucharist*, which they affirm'd *to be the sole Image of his Body, that Christ had recommended to us.* To cut this off throughly, he scruples not to assert, what none had ever done before him, That *the Bread, and Wine, and the Water, by the Invocation and coming down of the Holy Ghost, are supernaturally chang'd into the Body and Blood of Christ; and so now they are no longer two distinct, but one and the same thing.* And a little after he hath these words; *The Bread, and the Wine, are not the Types and Figures of the Body and Blood of Christ, God forbid, but they are the Deified Body it self of our Lord; since he himself hath said, This is not the Type or Figure of my Body, but my Body; not the Figure of my Blood, but my Blood.* Thus according to the common Observation, that one Error is maintained by bringing in the aid of another: This Monk calls in the Real substantial Presence as an Auxiliary to defend the worship of Images.

Joan. Damascen. de Orthodoxâ Fide. Lib. 4. c. 14.

Aud

And thus the beginnings of Transformation were form'd, till by degrees it grew up to that monſtrous Opinion, which now frightens all our Senſes and Reaſon. It was firſt introduced, becauſe thought neceſſary for the ſupport of Idolatry, and for the ſame Reaſons the Church of *Rome* at laſt adopted it, and ſo zealouſly continues it. It muſt be confeſs'd, that *Damaſcenes* Expreſſion is not preciſely the ſame with Tranſubſtantiation, nor ſpeaks he out ſo broadly as the Church of *Rome* does; yet it hath a very ſuſpicious Face, which looks that way, and imports the ſame thing, though not in expreſs terms. For to ſay that the Bread and Wine are ſo chang'd into Chriſt's Body and Blood, as they are no longer diſtinct, but one and the ſame thing, is in effect to aſſert, that the firſt are tranſubſtantiated into the laſt.

However, theſe two Greek Monks left at leaſt the old Expreſſions concerning the Euchariſt, if not quite abandon'd the Faith; and they were the firſt whoſe new Mode of ſpeaking began to be ſuſpected in this Article.

It was from this Great Champion of Image-Worſhip, that the ſecond Council of *Nice*, (which was conven'd by the Empreſs *Irene*, in the Year 787, to reſcin'd the Acts of the former, and to reeſtabliſh Images) in their fifth Seſſion examin'd this ſame Argument, which the Fathers of that ſame Council at *Conſtantinople* had urged againſt Images to prove them needleſs and frivolous, ſince Chriſt in the Euchariſt had inſtituted the Image of his Body as ſufficient to repreſent him, without any other.

Baronius, Ibid. Tom. 9. ad Annum 787. pag. 391. Act. 5. ſecundi Niceni Concilii in Collect. Concil. Labbei Tom.

And it is very remarkable, that the Anſwer which they made to it, they borrow entirely from *Damaſcene:* For they declare almoſt in the ſame words as he had done above thirty Years before, *That neither Jeſus Chriſt, nor the Apoſtles, nor the Fathers, have ever call'd the unbloody Sacrifice offer'd by the Prieſts an Image, but they nam'd it the Body it ſelf, and the Blood it ſelf. The Gifts are call'd, piouſly, Antitypes, by ſome of the Fathers, before the Conſecration is perfected; but after the Conſecration, they are call'd properly, they are really, and are to be believed to be the Body and Blood of Chriſt, becauſe, if it be the Image of his Body, it cannot be the ſame Divine Body.*

But

But tho *Damascene*, and the second Council of *Nice* started this new, and unto former times unknown Opinion about the Eucharist; yet the ancient Faith was still preserv'd in this Point, and few, or none embrac'd the Innovation. *Bede* who liv'd in the same Age retains the names of Signs or Figures in the Sacrament, when he says, that *Our Lord gave us the Sacrament of his Body and Blood under the figure of Bread and Wine, and that he gave to his Disciples the figure of his Body, and of his Blood.* And *Charles the Great*, who survived long after this Council, writing to his Preceptor *Alcuinus*. *Our Lord*, says he, *supping, broke the Bread, and gave them the Cup for the Figure of his Body, and his Blood, and gave them a great Sacrament for our profit.*

Beda in Luc. c. 22. Idem in Psal. 3.

De Rot. Septuag. ad Alcuin.

As two Greek Monks were the first who started this Notion of the real substantial Presence in the Eastern, so a Monk of *Corbie* in 818. was the first Inventer of this unintelligible Mystery in the Western Church. It was *Paschasius Ratbertus* who affected a new way of expressing himself, different from all the former and of his own Age, denying the Bread and Wine to be Signs of Christ's Body, but that the first were chang'd into the Substance of the other. To him therefore is due the Honour of hammering out the Notion, tho not of coyning the word Transubstantiation. And so He, not *Berengarius* first made the Eucharist a Controversy by disputing against what was before generally receiv'd. The real Presence in the Bread and Wine not substantially, but as in the Signs, and Sacrament of them, and thus created a Contest, which was very warm in his own time, and hath since distracted all *Christendom*. And he was the first original of this Mischief; for tho *John Damascene*, and the second Council of *Nice* declar'd the same thing in Effect, yet besides that, neither the new Language of the one, nor the Decisions of the other were much regarded, or thought worthy of notice. This Monk of *Corbie* spoke out more plainly, and alarm'd all this part of *Europe* with the Strangeness of a new Opinion unheard before, and contrary to the perpetual Belief of the Church in all Ages. And that he was the first Father of this now so great

Article

Article of Faith, both *Bellarmine* and *Sirmondus* frankly own. *That Author* (says the famous Cardinal) *was the first, who professedly wrote of the Reality of Christ's Body and Blood in the Eucharist. And he first of all* (says the other Learned Jesuit) *hath so explained the true Sense of the Catholick Church, that he open'd the way to all others, who have since wrote of the same matter.*

Bellarminus de Scriptoribus Eccleſiaſticis. In Paſcaſio Ratberto.

Sirmondus in vitâ Paſchaſii præfixâ ejus Oper. Impr. Paris.

And that his Opinions were new, and founded oddly in the Church, is evident from the rough Entertainment both they and their Author found. If we will believe himſelf, he was deſpis'd as a phantaſtical Young Man, who with a raſh Boldneſs advanc'd new Opinions; or as a wild Viſionary, who would impoſe his Dreams on the reſt of Mankind. For what other occaſion than this could move him to write in ſuch terms as theſe to his intimate Friend? *You have* (says he) *at the end of the Book* (meaning his own Diſcourſe of the Body and Blood of Chriſt) *the Sentiments of the Catholick Fathers, which I have briefly marked, that you may know it is not by Enthuſiaſm, or an Inſpiration of Raſhneſs, that I have had theſe Viſions, when I was but yet a young Man.* To what end ſhould he thus expreſs himſelf, were it not to efface thoſe reproachful Aſperſions, which were commonly thrown upon him? And how can we imagine all the learned and good Men of his time would have thus upbraided him, if his Opinions had been conſonant to the Faith of the Church? Or, if indeed he delivered nothing but what was generally believ'd among Chriſtians; what means he by theſe words to the ſame Friend, propounding ſome difficulties concerning his Doctrine, *You queſtion me*, says he, *upon a thing, of which a great many doubt?* So far was it from being any part of the Catholick Creed. And in his Comment on the 26th of *Matthew* he ſpeaks his own diffidence how his Opinions were entertain'd.

Paſchaſius Ratbertus Epiſt. ad Trudegardum.

Paſchaſius Ratbertus Ibid. In Biblioth. Patr. Tom. 6. p. 285. Ed. 3. *Binii.*

I have treated (says he) *of theſe things more at length, becauſe I underſtand that ſome reprove me, as if in my Book of the Sacraments, which I have publiſhed, I gave to the words of Chriſt more than the Truth would permit.* So that he ſeems in the whole Conduct of their Affair to manage himſelf like a Man, who deſigned to ſet up himſelf as

the Author of a new Hypotheſis in Religion, and agreeably uſes all Addreſs and Arts of Inſinuation, to gain Credit unto his Aſſertions, that they might be accepted.

And now what was the dear Opinion, with which he was ſo enamour'd, and which he ſo ſtudiouſly endeavour'd to promote? I will give it in his own words.

Paſchaſius Ratbertus de Corp. & Sang. Domini, c. 1. in Biblioth. Patr. Ibid. 247.

Tho, ſays he, *there is the Figure or Appearance of Bread and Wine, yet we muſt abſolutely believe that it is no other after the Conſecration, than the Body and Blood of Chriſt: for which Reaſon Truth it ſelf ſaid to his Diſciples, It is my Fleſh for the Life of the World. And to ſpeak ſomething more admirable*, (obſerve how he applauds the rarity of his Notion) *It is not at all any other Fleſh, than what is born of the Virgin* Mary, *which ſuffered on the Croſs, and is riſen from the Grave.* This, I muſt confeſs, is to aſſert the Real and Subſtantial Preſence in high and expreſſive terms: but herein he is alone, ſince none ever before him, but two Greek Monks, and the Conventicle at *Nice*, offer'd any thing reſembling; nor had he above two or three of his Temporaries to follow him. I am ſure all the Learning and Piety of the Times wherein he lived, vigorouſly oppos'd him, and how much they differ'd from him, let us but hear from himſelf. After having repeated the words of the Inſtitution, *Take, eat, this is my Body*, he adds, *Let*

Paſchaſius Ratbertus Comment. in Mat. 26. pag. 290. Ibid.

thoſe who will extenuate this term of Body, ſaying, that it is not the true Fleſh of Jeſus Chriſt which we celebrate in the Sacrament, nor his true Blood, but hear theſe words: They feign I know not what, as tho there was in the Sacrament, only a certain vertue of the Fleſh and Blood of Chriſt in ſuch manner that our Saviour muſt have ſpoke falſe, and that it is not indeed the true Fleſh, and the true Blood, &c. *When he broke and gave the Bread to his Diſciples, he ſaid not, This is, or there is in this Myſtery a certain Vertue, or a Figure of my Body, but he hath ſaid, This is my Body.* And a little after, *I am amaz'd at it, that ſome now will ſay it is not the reality of the Fleſh and Blood of Chriſt in the thing it ſelf, but in the Sacrament, a certain Efficacy of the Fleſh, and not the Fleſh, a Vertue of the Blood, and not the Blood; a Figure and not the Reality; a Shadow, and not the Body.*

And

And this Doctrine which all believed but himself, is perfectly agreeable to what was the Faith of the Ancient Church, and is now the Faith of the Protestant Churches.

So upon the whole, That Catholick Church which hath in all Ages according to the Author of the Reasons, *&c.* asserted the Real and Substantial Presence is no where as yet to be found but in this poor Monk of *Corbie*, or two or three deluded by him, since all the rest of *Christendom* asserted the Real Presence no otherwise than as in the beginning of the Discourse I explained it, and have prov'd it to be the meaning of the Fathers, and general Consent of the Church, till this unhappy Age, wherein *Ratbertus* in his Melancholy Cell hammers out a Notion, which hath fill'd the World with Disputes, and puzled the best Wits of the Church of *Rome* to make it out.

No sooner had this Innovation thus begun to change the Doctrine of Faith, than a holy Zeal for the Truth warm'd the greatest Men of the Age, wherein he liv'd, to draw their Pens against him, and some of them were heated to a little Indignation.

Rabanus Maurus was the most considerable Person of his Time for Learning and Wit: As a Poet he is prais'd by *Antoninus*, that he excelled all who liv'd with him; and in all respects *Trithemius* adorns him with this high Elogy, That *Italy* never saw any thing resembling him, nor *Germany* ever produc'd his equal. From a Monk of the Monastery of *Fuld* a City on the *Frontiers* of *Franconia*, he was created Abbot of it; from whence his Merits remov'd him to the Arch-bishoprick of *Mentz*, where, by the Command of *Lewis* the second, Emperour, he conven'd a Synod, which decreed several things useful for the Reformation of that Church. So that his Character gives him more Authority to support him, than a private Monk. He through all his Writing asserts the true and ancient Faith of the Church, in opposition to what *Ratbertus* had newly vented, and calls his, a wicked Opinion.

Antonin. Chron. part 2. Tit. 14. c. 5. pag. 423. Ed. Junt. Lugd.

Trithem. in Catal. Script. Eccles.

Rabanus Maurus in pœnitent. cap. 33. de Eucharist.

Walafridus Strabo, who, by the account *Antoninus* gives of him, was Scholar to him I have mention'd, joyn'd

Antonin. Ibid. p. 494.

with him in defending the same Truth against this dangerous Innovation. To these I might add a great many others, *Amalarius*, and *Heriboldus*, the one Arch-bishop of *Treves*, the other Bishop of *Auxerre*. Both of them famous for Learning and Wisdom, which recommended the latter of them to the favour of his Prince *Charles the Bald*. And with these *Prudentius* Bishop of *Troys*, and *Florus* Deacon of *Lyons*, united in the same Zeal to overturn the Novel Tenents of this Monk.

Robert Altissiodor. Mon. Chron. citante Usserio de Eccles. Success. c. 2.

But there were two of greater Name who professedly wrote against him by the particular Command of *Charles the Bald*, who, sensible of the Divisions which this Novelty in Religion had made among his Subjects, to stop the growing Disorder, employed the two Men who had the highest Reputation for Learning to refute it. These two were *Joannes Scotus Erigena*, and *Bertram*. The first of them was admir'd as the most accomplish'd in all kind of Knowledg, for whom, as the Emperour had a peculiar esteem, so he consulted his Judgment, especially in this new-rais'd Controversy about the Presence of Christ's Body in the Eucharist, and order'd him to confute *Ratbert*. In Obedience to which Command (as appears by an Epistle of *Berengarius* extant in the Collections of *D'Achery*) he compos'd that Discourse of the Sacrament, which was afterward judg'd Heretical, and condemned to be burnt by the Council which was called at *Vercelli* against *Berengarius*. But however the Book afterward met with this hard fate, yet in this Age neither that, or its Author were ever question'd, and tho that Learned Man, for some uncommon Opinions which he held, had rais'd himself greater Enemies, and amongst the rest *Remy* Arch-bishop of *Lyons*, and *Florus* the Arch-Deacon, who treated him with sharpness enough, yet they never accused him of any Error as to the Eucharist, which they would never fail'd to have done, if he had advanc'd any Opinion contrary to the general Faith. He liv'd and dyed in the favour of the two greatest Princes of that Age, *Alfred*, and *Charles* the Emperour, who would certainly have disown'd him if he had been tainted with Heresy.

He

He poſſeſs'd Employments in the Church, to which he would never have been admitted, if he had in the leaſt been blacken'd with ſo invidious a Character. He left the Emperor's Court upon the invitation he had from *Alfred* into *England*, that he might be the principal Ornament of the new-founded Univerſity at *Oxford*; and to him he alſo truſted the Education of his Children. And yet this Man, ſo much admir'd and courted by two Kings, muſt be an Apoſtate from the Faith, and an Heretick, and *Paſchaſius* be the only true Catholick. He after this was choſen to read Divinity in the Monaſtery at *Malmsbury*, where, by the young Scholars, at the inſtigation of the Monks, he was ſtabb'd; and afterwards, as *Antonius* tells us, was accounted a Martyr: And as *Leſly* the Scotiſh Hiſtorian reports it, 'Twas by the Authority of the Pope he was e'roll'd in that Catalogue. And beſide the Teſtimony of theſe two Hiſtorians, the ſame thing is manifeſt by his Epitaph, extant in *William* of *Malmsbury*:

Antonin. Chron. part. 2. Tit. 16. c. 2. p. 601. *Leſlæus* de Rebus Geſtis Scotor. Lib. 5.

Here lies John *the Holy Philoſopher, who in his Life was enriched with admirable Learning, and at laſt had the Honour to paſs through Martyrdom to the Kingdom of Heaven.*

Gulielmus Malmesbur. de Geſtis Regum Angl. lib. 2. cap. 5.

Which makes the Conjecture of the Learned Biſhop of *Durham* probable, that the occaſion of his Murder was, becauſe ſome ſuperſtitious Monks of that Monaſtery, who were infected with *Ratbert*'s wild Notions, could not bear to hear him refute them in his Lectures, and ſo urg'd the young Scholars to aſſaſſinate him. And therefore with reaſon might he be judged a Martyr, as dying for defence of the Truth, againſt the Innovations of the *Corbeian* Monks.

Coſin Hiſt. Tranſubſtant. Papal. cap. 5. §. 32.

It is a great unhappineſs that his Book is loſt, being unjuſtly branded with Hereſy, and burnt by the *Vercellian* Council, when Death had remov'd the Author far enough out of their reach. We may yet be certain, that he affirm'd the Bread and Wine to be Signs of Chriſt's Body and Blood, ſince *Berengarius*, as he profeſs'd to have

have had this Doctrine from him, so he pleaded the Name of this Great Man in his defence. And by this we may be assur'd too, that he denied the Real substantial Presence, since his last writing was compos'd expresly against *Paschasius Ratbertus*, who had newly broached that Opinion.

I will not say much of the other excellent Person employ'd by *Charles the Bald* in the same Work with *Joannes Scotus*: By whose Order he compil'd against *Ratbert* that incomparable Discourse of the Body and Blood of Christ, which to the great benefit of the Church, had a better destiny than that of *Erigena*, and still hath surviv'd. Of which, because newly translated into our own Language, I need say the less, since every one who hath but the curiosity, may see what Doctrine was taught in those days; and that it was indeed the same for which *Berengarius* in the Apostacy of following Times, almost two hundred Years after, was falsly convicted of Heresy. I will only add this concerning *Bertram*, or *Ratramn*, that he was not only in great favour with his King, but of so high esteem in the Church, that he was chosen by all the Clergy of *France*, to write in defence of the Latin Church against the Greeks.

And this is enough to convince, that the Doctrine of *Paschasius* concerning the Real substantial Presence, was not only new, and unknown, but detested by all the worthy Men of his Age; and indeed I should have wondred by what strange Infatuation it obtain'd amongst any in the following Century, and so by degrees grew into credit amongst many of the Priests. If I did not reflect what gross Ignorance darken'd all the Times intervening, between the condemnation of *Berengarius*, and the Death of *R. Maurus*, *J. Scotus*, *Bertram*, &c. As if the last small remains of Piety and Learning, had expir'd with the Breath of those Great Men, and forsook the World when they left it. It is then no wonder, if in the succeeding Age, grosly stupid, and which had an unaccountable Devotion to Adoration of Images, and Invocation of Saints; the most unreasonable Assertion

that

that was ever offer'd to Mens Minds, was embrac'd: And in an Age, that began to be so strangely addicted to Idolatry, it is not to be admired, if a Doctrine was readily receiv'd, which might be thought serviceable to promote it: Since, as I before observ'd, it was to defend the Worship of Images, which induced *Damascene*, and the second Council of *Nice*, to give birth to this Notion of the Real Substantial Presence of Christ's Body in the Sacrament.

But as yet this Opinion of *Paschasius Ratbertus* was not establish'd by the Authority of the Church, since the two Popes, *Nicholas* the First, and *Adrian* the Second, were silent Spectators of the new rais'd Quarrel, without interesting themselves. And though the Novelty, for the Reasons I have mention'd, pleas'd many of the Priests, and in time acquired some number of followers, yet through the Ninth and Tenth Centuries, the greatest part of the Church still retain'd the Ancient Faith; and it was the ordinary Business of their Disputes, to hunt down this new-started Opinion.

Thus when *Odo Severus* was Arch-bishop of *Canterbury*, in the Year 950, there was a great Contest among his Clergy concerning the Eucharist; some affirming the former Substance to continue, and that it was only the Figure, or Sign of Christ's Body and Blood. And all that the Arch-Bishop alleadg'd in solution of the Argument, was only the Instances of strange incredible Miracles wrought by the Sacrament. For this was the course they took to spread the belief of the Real Substantial Presence among the People.

Balæus Script. Brit. Cent. 2. pag. 128. Ed. 1557. Et *Gulielm. Malmsbur.* de Gestis Pontif. Angl. Lib. 1.

The Priests, by several Impostures, and *lying Miracles*, which they ascrib'd to the Host, endavour'd to perswade them, that it was really Christ's Body, since they could not think that any other was capable of doing such prodigious things. But only the Ignorant were obnoxious to be so grossly abus'd by vain frivolous Stories; and among the Wise and Learned, few Proselytes were gain'd; for they still expressed themselves the old way, contrary to *Paschasius*.

Of

Of these numerous Instances might be given, as of *Elfric* Abbot of *Malmsbury*, (whose Saxon Homily is cited to this purpose by the most Pious and Learned *Usher*) of *Wulfine* Bishop of *Sherburn*, *Heringerius* Abbot of *Labes*, *Ratherius* Bishop of *Verona*, *Leutheric* Arch-bishop of *Sens*, *Fulbert* Bishop of *Chartres*, and innumerable others of the Tenth and Eleventh Centuries.

Answer to a Jesuit. p. 54. last Ed. 1686.

By this it appears, that it was not *Berengarius* (as the Author of the Reasons, &c. avows) who first made it a publick Dispute; since at the first starting of the Substantial Presence by *Paschasius*, it was opposed as an Innovation; for the Author of the Reasons, *&c.* hath given it very imperfect.

Pag. 14.

Gratian. Decret. Par. 3. Dist. 2. de consecr. p. 1796. Ed. Junt.

This then is the Form of the Abjuration: *I* Berengarius *the unworthy Deacon of St.* Maurice, *of the Church of* Angers, *Knowing the true Catholick and Apostolical Faith, Anathematize all Heresy, especially that for which I have hitherto been defam'd; which endeavours to maintain, that the Bread and Wine which are plac'd upon the Altar, are after the Consecration only a Sacrament, and not the true Body and Blood of our Lord Jesus Christ; nor that he can, unless Sacramentally only, be sensually handled or broken with the hands of the Priest, or be broken or grinded between the teeth of the Faithful. But I consent to the Holy Roman and Apostolic Sees; and with Mouth and Heart, I profess that I hold the same Faith concerning the Sacraments of the Lord's Table; which* Nicholas *the Lord and venerable Pope, and this Holy Synod, with Evangelical and Apostolical Authority hath delivered and confirmed to me to be held,* viz. *That the Bread and Wine which are put upon the Altar after the Consecration, are not only the Sacrament, but the true Body and Blood of our Lord Jesus Christ, and sensually not only Sacramentally, but in reality is handled and broken by the hands of the Priests, and grinded with the teeth of the Faithful; swearing by the Holy and Coessential Trinity, and by these most Holy Gospels of Christ. But those who shall oppose this Faith, I pronounce to be worthy of eternal Anathema, together with their Opinions and Followers. But if I my self at any time presume to think or declare any thing against this, I must submit to the severity of the Canons. To this read, and perfected, I have freely subscribed.*

This

This is what was forced on *Berengarius* to Subſcribe, which we cannot doubt but was done againſt the inward ſence of his own mind; ſince *Lanfranc* himſelf upbraids him that his Abjuration was diſſembled, and only in ſhew, not in the ſincerity of his heart. And *Berengarius* himſelf as ſoon as out of their power writes a Book to retract his Abjuration. No ſooner is he out of the noiſe of their Threats, and his own ſilenced fears permitted his ſtrain'd Soul to return to its natural poſture; but he writes againſt the Pope and Council in the ſharpeſt Expreſſions, which the Indigation of a wronged, and abuſed Conſcience could dictate. He affords you no better name than a *Church of Malignants, a Council of Vanity, not Apoſtolical, but the Seat of Satan.* He grievouſly complains that this Recantation was extorted from him either by threats, or more violent methods, and that it was not to be Interpreted his Act, ſo much as *Humberts*, who compoſed the Form of it for him, and forced his hand to ſubſcribe it. And theſe juſt Reproaches *Lanfrancus* makes it his great care to wipe out.

Lanfranc. Ibid. p. 300.

Apud Lanfranum ib. p. 312.

Ibid. p. 300.

And yet the Pope, and his Council accounted it a great Victory, which they gained over him, and in Triumph ſent the Copies of his Abjuration through all the Cities of *Italy*, *Germany*, and *France*.

Baronius Annal. Tom. 11. ad An. 1059. *Gratian* Decr. part 3. diſt. 2. cap. 42.

Pope *Nicholas* the II. being otherwiſe employed in maintaining the Wars which he had raiſed in *Apulia*, *Berengarius* lived undiſturbed almoſt thirty years, till the furious *Hildebrand* came to the Papacy, which he aſſumed with the name of *Gregory* VII. In the ſeventh year of his Popedom, and 1079. of our Redemption he calls a Synod at *Rome*, where *Berengarius* now fourſcore years old, being ſummoned a ſecond time, appears. Here when his Controverſie came to be debated, the Biſhops of the Council were divided, and he had many of them, who diſputed on his ſide. And it would ſeem as if the Council was almoſt equally parted between the Pope and *Berengarius*. If what the Cardinal *Benno* reports be true, that *Gregory* appointed a Faſt to all the Cardinals, that God might manifeſt by a ſign from Heaven who was moſt Orthodox in the Faith. He, or *Berengarius*. This looks as though a good number of his Biſhops ſtood ſo firm for *Berengarius*, that nothing leſs than a Miracle could ſhake them. At leaſt the Opinion in thoſe times of the Popes Infallibility was very mean, ſince it needed to be ſtrengthned by ſome Divine

In Act. Concil.

Benno Card. in vita *Hildebr.*

Oracle. But as God did not speak in the Council, so the whole Affair was decided without him, and the poor old *Berengarius* was a second time obliged to abjure though in a different Form, then that imposed on him in the preceding Council.

It runs in these Terms.

Baronius An. Tom. 11. ad An. 1079.

I Berengarius *believe with my heart, and confess with my mouth, that the Bread and Wine which are placed upon the Altar, and by the Mystery of Consecration, and the words of our Redeemer substantially changed, into the true, and proper, and quickning Flesh and Blood of Jesus Christ our Lord, and that after the Consecration it is the true Body of Christ which was born of the Virgin, and which Offered for the Salvation of the World did hang on the Cross, and which sits at the right hand of the Father, and the true Blood of Christ, which was poured out from his side, not only by a sign and virtue of the Sacrament but in the property of Nature, and truth of substance, as is contained in this brief; and I have read, and you understand, so I believe, nor will I further teach contrary to this Faith. So help me God, and these Holy Gospels of God.*

This was his last Abjuration, which he did not long survive; whether he recovered his true Faith again is variously reported by Historians, but if we will credit one who lived in his time, and so was capable of giving the best account of him, he to his latest breath continued in the Belief, and maintaining of his true Doctrine. But almost all agree in honouring him with a very Glorious Character, as a person every way Excellent, Learned above all of his time, and of most strict and exemplary holiness. And when broken with so many troubles, he retired from the World; he distributes a large Estate, which he possessed, among the Poor; his deserved Reputation made him lov'd and admir'd, and the truth of his Doctrine managed with his admirable wit perswaded great numbers to embrace it, so that as Historians assure us, it was become the General Faith, and his Enemies could not otherwise have run it down but by Force and Power.

Bertold. constant. *Chron.* An. 1083. Apud Urstesii Histor. Illustr. *German.* *Anton. Chron.* part 2. Tit. 16. c. 1. Sect. 28. pag. 507. Ed. Junt. *Mat. Paris* Hist. *Angl.* pag. 17. Ed. *Lond.* prima. 1571. *Antoninus* lb. *Guilielmus Neubrig* de Rebus *Anglicis* sui Temp. Lib. 2. cap. 13.

Nor did his Doctrine expire with his Life. We have the Testimony of one of our own Historians, that in the year 1163. almost an hundred after his death, all *France*, *Spain*, *Italy* and *Germany*, was filled with his Disciples.

Wernerus Rolewink Fasic. Temporum ad Annum 1054. Apud pistor. Tom. 2. *Germ.* Scriptor.

But

But *Paſchaſius Ratberts* Doctrine of Chriſts ſubſtantial Preſence getting ground among the vulgar by the Artifices of the Prieſts in the eleventh Age, *Brunon* the Biſhop, and *Berengarius* the Arch-Deacon of *Angers* diſdaining to ſee the Error ſpread ſo faſt were more than ordinarily zealous in oppoſing it. But it was more endear'd to the Clergy by the awe and veneration which they found the Belief of it had procured to them among the People, who could not but reverence, almoſt to Adoration, perſons who had ſuch extraordinary power. As firſt, to make their God, and then to carry it about in their hands. They were highly alarm'd, that any ſhould attempt to diſabuſe the poor Creatures, and therefore the honeſt endeavours of *Brunon* and *Berengarius* ſet all the Prieſt-hood on a flame who raiſed a diſmal cry againſt the good Biſhop, and his Arch-Deacon, as Heretics, and Enemies of the Church.

It was *Leo* IX. who then ſate in the Papal Chair, a Man of Honeſty and Integrity, but good-natur'd and eaſie, and Governed by the Councils of *Humbert* and *Hildebrand* whom he created Cardinals. It was no difficulty for the Enemies of *Berengarius* to make him believe any thing they had a mind he ſhould, and therefore they ſoon poſſeſſed him with a prejudice againſt the Arch-Deacon's Doctrine, and obtained of him to call a Synod at *Rome* to ſtop that which they called a moſt Peſtilent Hereſie. Here *Berengarius* was Condemned abſent, and unheard, without their ſo much as knowing what his Opinion was, but as it was odiouſly repreſented by his ſworn Adverſaries, much leſs examining, and debating it. And *Lanfranc* himſelf who was afterward the Man which wrote with the greateſt bitterneſs againſt him was ſuſpected as a favourer of his Opinions, and probably not without reaſon, ſince there was ſome intimacy of friendſhip between them, as appears by the Letters of *Berengarius* to him, wherein he freely communicated his Thoughts which Letters being Intercepted brought him into ſuſpicion, and he was required to purge himſelf by openly proteſting againſt him and his Doctrine; which he did. This Council was Celebrated at *Rome* in 1050.

Platina in vita *Leon.* IX.

Lanfrancus de Sacramento. In Bibliotheca patr. Tom. 6. Ed. 3. *Bunil.* pag. 302. &c. *Baron.* Annal. Tom. 11. ad An. 1050. *Barcnius* Ibid. *Lanfrancus* Ibid.

Brunon was cooled by the fear of his powerful oppoſers, but *Berengarius* ſtood firm, and was not ſo much diſheartned as animated by this Judgment of the Council, to make a more vigorous defence, and by the force of his reaſons, and the inſtances

he produced from Antiquity, which countenanced his Doctrine, it ſo admirably ſpread, that there were few in all *France* which did not entertain it, ſo little were they Influenced by the decrees of the *Roman* Council.

Matth. Paris, Hiſtor. Angliæ pag. 17. Ed. Prima, *Lond.* 1571.

Upon this the Pope thought it neceſſary to renew againſt him the Thunder of the Church, and in the latter end of the ſame year aſſembles another Council at *Vercells*, and that the proceedings of this might look fairer than thoſe of the former, they ſummoned *Berengarius* to appear, who came not in perſon, but ſent two of his Clergy to act his cauſe for him. But he was as ſpeedily condemned in this Council as the former, and with him *Joannes Scotus Erigena* tho' dead long before ſuffered the ſame Fate, and his Book againſt *Paſchaſius Ratbertus* order'd to be burnt.

Lanfrancus, Ibid. pag. 303.

Now *Paſchaſius* his opinion was ſtrengthened by the Authority of the Church; and as intereſt governs a great part of Mankind, it is no wonder, if that which before had but few aſſenters, now was by many zealouſly embraced, when backed with Power, and recommended by advantage. And yet ſtill the proſcribed *Berengarius* had many Advocates who ſtood up in his defence, and all that was yet done, rather fomented than extinguiſhed the heat of the Diſpute.

Victor the Second, who was *Leo*'s Succeſſor, in the papal Dignity convenes another Council at *Tours* in *France*, which next followed that at *Vercells*. The Author of the Reaſons, *&c.* makes one to meet at *Paris*, that number might not be wanting, but upon what grounds I know not, unleſs on the Authority of *Durandus*, Abbot of *Troarn* in *Normandy*, who ſpeaks of a Council called at *Paris* by *Henry* the firſt; but the little credit of the Story is ſufficiently expoſed by that great Church Antiquary Monſieur *Larroque*. It was in 1055. that *Victor* ſummoned this Council at *Tours*, where *Berengarius* freely appears, when he could do it now with ſafety of his Perſon. In this Council *Hildebrand* who was afterward *Gregory* the Seventh, preſides as the Pope's Legate in *France*, who if we will believe *Guilmundus*, ſoon convinced *Berengarius*, and prevailed with him to ſubſcribe his Recantation, and that, if *Lanfranc* ſays true without ſpeaking a word in his own Defence. But beſides that we have but little reaſon to truſt his profeſſed Adverſaries who breathe the greateſt Paſſion and fierceneſs againſt him, *Lanfranc* contradicts *Guilmundus* when he tells us that all his Recantation was only

Baronius Annal. Tom. 11. ad Annum. 1055.

Hiſtoire de l'Euchariſtie part. 2. Chap. 17.

Guilmundus de Sacrament. l. 3. in Bibl. Patr. Tom. 6. pag. 368. Ed. 3. *Binnii*.

Lanfranc. de Sacrament. Ibid. pag. 303.

only an acknowledgment, that he profeſſed the common Faith of the Church, which he might very well do without renouncing his own Doctrine, ſince it was perfectly agreeable. He might indeed diſclaim what he never affirmed, that the Bread and Wine in the Sacrament, are empty, naked Signs and Figures unaccompanied with any Spiritual Efficacy, but this was to explain his Faith, and to vindicate it from their miſtaken Prejudices, not to deny it. *Lanfranc.* Ibid.

However he reſolutely perſiſted in aſſerting his Doctrine, and all theſe Councils had very little availed to ſuppreſs it. Nor were his Enemies ſatisfied in the former profeſſion of his Faith at *Tours*. It was not enough for him to deny the Elements of the Euchariſt to be mere Signs, but they will have him to aſſert the real Preſence in all the groſs Terms wherein themſelves explained it, as any Man may read them in the Diſcourſes of *Lanfrancus Guilmundus* and *Algeſus* concerning the Sacrament. They will therefore oblige him to ſign a new Confeſſion, which might be fully expreſſive of the corporeal Preſence. To this purpoſe they prevail with *Nicholas* the ſecond to convocate a fourth Council againſt him, which he did in the Lateran at *Rome*, in the year 1059. wherein himſelf was preſent with a Hundred and thirteen Biſhops. Hither *Berengarius* comes in perſon upon the Summons. But he did not at the very firſt abjure without pleading any thing in defence of his Faith, as *Lanfranc* relates the matter, who ſcruples not to report, that he dar'd not defend his doctrine, but preſently reſigned himſelf to the Judgment of the Council, ready to believe whatever they would have him, and therefore asked that they would compoſe a Formulary for him, which he might ſubſcribe. On the contrary the controverſy was warmly diſputed, and *Berengarius* was not wanting to employ in his cauſe all that Learning and Eloquence for which he was juſtly famous. And ſo Invincible is the force of Truth with ſuch ſuccours to aid it that as *Leo* the Cardinal of *Oſtia*, and B. *Sigonius* tell us he bore down all before him, and not a Man in the Council could withſtand the Strength of his Diſcourſes, only *Alberic* the Cardinal Deacon, a Man Learned and Eloquent coped with him, but with unequal ability, and was reduced to demand eight days time to frame an Anſwer againſt him. It may therefore very much be ſuſpected, that more ſenſible Arguments than Reaſons were made uſe of to force him to abjure, and that they failed

Baronius Annal. To. 11. ad Annum 1059. *Algerus* de Sacrament. l. 1. c. 19. In Biblioth. Patr. To. 6. p. 419.

Lanfranc. de Sacrament. Ibid. p. 301.

In Chron. Caſſini. Lib. 3. c. 33. *Sigonius* de Regn. Italiæ Lib. 9. pag. 211. *Ed. Wechelii.* *Papyrius Maſſonius* Annal. Franc. Lib. 3. pag. 236. *Ed. Paris*, Quarto.

failed not to employ all that might be effectual to conquer the weakneſs of a Man. However he did now make a full Recantation, and becauſe they would be ſure to have it in all reſpects ratifying, it was by order of the Pope and Council drawn by the Cardinal *Humbert* in theſe terms, as now extant in *Lanfrancus*, and *Algerus*, and *Gratian*, from whom I will tranſcribe it, and though the opinion of *Paſchaſius Ratbertus* thus ſtamp'd with the pretended Authority of the Church in five ſeveral Councils paſs'd more currantly among ſome now than before, when it was left to be debated by Arguments; yet it was not admitted by all, and in defiance to theſe deciſions the Doctrine of *Berengarius* was conſiderable both for the number and quality of thoſe who openly maintained it. For *Urban* the ſecond, the Succeſſor of *Gregory* the Seventh thought it neceſſary to aſſemble another Council at *Piacenza* in *Italy*, in the Year 1095. to renew the Condemnation of that Doctrine. And yet this was not ſtrong enough to enforce a General Renunciation; for thoſe who were moſt famous in Learning and Piety in the next Century ſtill preſerved and vindicated the antient Faith, and among the reſt, St. *Bernard* in 1120. moſt clearly explains his Sence agreeable to it, when he diſcourſes of the Elements in the Euchariſt as viſible Signs, which convey to us Inviſible Grace and Bleſſings. And *Rupert Abbot* of *Duitz*, near *Cologne*, (which inſtance the Author of the Reaſons he himſelf aſſigns) tho' he had a notion peculiar to himſelf at that time of a natural Union between Chriſt and the Bread, yet contrary to what theſe Councils had decreed, he denied the ſubſtantial Converſion of one into the other. And *Peter Lombard* himſelf, the Father of the Schoolmen, who wrote his Book of Sentences about 1140. tho he thinks it conſonant to the Mind of the Fathers, that there is a change of the Bread and Wine into the Body and Blood of Chriſt, (which none will deny to be underſtood in a tollerable Senſe) yet he was not ſo ſtrong in the new Faith, as to be certain whether the Change was ſubſtantial, but leaves it as a doubt. He indeed exerciſes all the Skill which he had in Philoſophy to evince the being of Accidents without a Subject, and to explain how Chriſt's Body might be broken into Parts, to ſalve as well as he could the credit of Pope *Nicholas* the Second and his Council, in the Form of Abjuration impoſed by them on *Berengarius*.

Bertbold. Conſtant. chron. ad 1095 apud Urſtitium Ibid.

Bernardus de cæna domini

Rupertus Tuitienſis in Exod. lib. 2. cap. 10.

Lombard. ſent. lib. 4. diſt. 10.

Ibid. diſt. 11.

It

It is needleſs to give any more Inſtances, Monſieur *Larroque* hath done it ſufficiently in his Hiſtory of the Euchariſt, and ſince that excellent Book is in *Engliſh*, any one may ſatisfy himſelf, that tho' the governing and intereſted part of the Church of *Rome*, had run down *Berengarius*, yet they could not his Doctrine, tho' they attempted it with the greateſt Induſtry and Violence. A multitude of People in the Southern Provinces of *France*, firſt called *Albigenſes*, and afterward *Waldenſes* profeſſed the ſame Faith, as that learned Man proves out of many Authors, and amongſt the reſt, from the Chronicle of St. *Tron*, in the Country of *Leige*, he gives this evidence of it: That *Rodolphus* the Abbot of that Monaſtery, to which he was preferred in 1125. and Author of the Chronicle, aſſigns this to be the Reaſon, which diverted him from an intended Journey into a certain Country which he names not; *That he heard it to be all infected with the antient Hereſy of the Body and Blood of Chriſt.* And there was indeed an entire Country ſo infected, if there be any Contagion in Truth, and the fierceſt proceedings could not ſtop its ſpreadings, and tho' *Peter de Bruis*, as the firſt Martyr that proteſted againſt Tranſubſtantiation was publickly burnt at St. *Giles's* in *Languedoc*; yet the Doctrine which he taught, as if ſcattered with his Aſhes, was diſperſed more than ever, nor was their Cruelty to *Arnauld* of *Breſs* more ſucceſsful, whom they burnt alive at *Rome* in the year 1155, and threw his Aſhes into the *Tyber*; for many began to ſuſpect that to be a Truth, which before they had not ſo well conſidered; when they ſaw theſe Men ſuffer for it with ſo admirable Conſtancy. Such examples at leaſt raiſed a Commiſeration of the unfortunate, if they did not convince.

But tho' the new Church of *Rome* was ſo zealous for her late adopted Article of Faith, as to ſacrifice Mens Lives to ſupport it, yet ſhe wanted a fit name by which the Invention might be called, till the middle of the twelfth Century. It is doubted who firſt bleſſed the World with ſo charming a word as Tranſubſtantiation. The Author of the Reaſons, &c. would aſcribe the word to *Paſchaſius Ratbertus*, who firſt beat out the Notion, or at leaſt makes him a doubtful Rival with *Petrus Bleſenſis* in the Honour. But there is not the leaſt Character of this wonderful word in the writings of *Paſchaſius*, and therefore the Glory would belong entirely to *Bleſenſis*, if *Stephen* Biſhop of *Autun* were not brought 1

L'Hiſtoire de l'Euchariſtie part. 2. ch. 18.

Apud d'Acherium. Tom. 7. Specileg.

Otto Friſing. in Frider. lib. 2. c. 20. apud Urſtitium Germ. Rer. ſcript.

Bleſenſis Epiſt. 40.

brought on the Stage to diſpute it with him. This is ſure enough that they both uſe the Expreſſion, but which of them was the Father of it is dubious, nor is it indeed very important to know.

Stephan. Eduenſis de Sacr. Alt. in Bibliotheca. patrum Tom. 6. ed. 3. Binnii p. 476.

It is certain the Word had the Good fortune to pleaſe, ſo that *Innocent* the III. who ſucceeded *Cæleſtine* the III. in the Papacy made it Sacred, and inviolable by placing it in the Decree of his *Lateran* Council. He was but thirty years of Age, when he mounted the Chair, and active, and brisk, in the heat of his youth, he meditated nothing but Greatneſs, and a Spiritual Monarchy. He deſigned nothing leſs than to Conquer the World by the power of the Keys, as the Old *Romans* had ſubdued it with their Swords, and to make that City as great in Spiritual Dominion, as her Ancient Citizens by their Courage had made her in Temporal, it is eaſie to deſcribe him by the Picture, which himſelf hath drawn, and he ſufficiently expreſſes the Ambition of his Spirit, when he Arrogates to himſelf that Commiſſion which was given to the Prophet. *To me* (ſays he) *it is ſpoken in the Prophet, I have appointed thee over Nations, and Kingdoms, that thou mayſt root out, deſtroy, and ruine, build, and plant. To me alſo it is ſaid in the perſon of the Apoſtle, to thee I will give the Keys of Heaven, for I am conſtituted in the midſt between God and Man, below God but above Man; yes, then Man I am greater, who can judge of all things, but be judged by none.* And it is a very pleaſant compariſon that he makes between the two Great Lights, which God Created in the Heaven, and Himſelf, and Kings. *As much difference as there is* (ſays he) *between the Sun and the Moon, ſo great is that between the Biſhops of* Rome *and Kings.* Suitable to this Character which he gives of himſelf is that by which our own Hiſtorian repreſents him. *He was Ambitious and Proud* (ſays *Matthew Paris*) *above all other Mortals, and prone and ready to all wickedneſs, for any reward either given or promiſed.* None could be a fitter Man then this to impoſe Tranſubſtantiation both thing and name on the Faith of the Church, ſince upon that Authority he had aſſumed to himſelf, he might venture to obtrude the higeſt abſurdities and contradictions without any fear of their being Queſtioned. He accordingly in a Council conven'd by him in the *Lateran* at *Rome* ſtroke the ſtrongeſt blow to faſten this ſtrange Article into the *Roman* Creed, which the Council at *Conſtance* in condemning *Wicliffs* Doctrine, farther confirmed, and the Council at *Trent* ſo irreverſibly

Platina in ejus vita.

Jer. 1. 10. *Innocen.* III. Serm. 2.

Epiſt. ad Imp. *Conſtantinop.* Extra de Majorit. & obed. c. 6.

Matth. Paris Hiſt. *Angl.* In vita *Johan.*

reversibly established, that it is become as necessary a part of Faith as the belief of the Trinity, or of Christs Incarnation. And thus is the true History of the Original, and progress of Transubstantiation, which now hath insensibly led me to the Third thing I propounded to prove, which is, that this odd Doctrine both in the notion and name hath been determined by the Church of *Rome* as a necessary Article of Faith.

There would need no more to evidence it than the former History of *Berengarius*, since the Decrees of so many Councils against him issue all in this, to define the manner of the Real Presence in the Sacrament to be by the conversion of the Bread and Wine into the Body and Blood of Christ, and therefore nothing would satisfie till he had abjured in the plainest words they could find most suitable to express this Sence. This appears by that Form I have before given out of *Gratian*, wherein it was not thought enough to say that the Bread and Wine after Consecration are the true Body and Blood of Christ, but in what manner they are so, is pronounced in high, and gross terms, that Christs Body is Sensually, and not meerly as in a Sacrament, handled by the Priest broken into parts, and grinded *by the teeth of the Faithful.* *Gratian* Loc. antea citato.

If this does not very grossly determine the *Modus* of the Real Presence, I know not what can. And yet this is done by Pope *Nicholas* the II. and his Council called by him at *Rome*, and imposed on poor *Berengarius* to be believed under pain of the severest Curses and Punishments; nor was it only forced on him, but declared to be a Rule of Faith to all other Men. And therefore *Lanfrancus*, and *Algerus*, in writing against him Appeal to the decision of this, and of the other Councils as the sure Standard, and Measure of Catholick Truth, it is accordingly placed in the Decretals of *Gratian*; and *Lombard* thought himself engaged to defend it, which he does very poorly; the expressions indeed are so rude that they far exceeded all that the Impudence of the Schools ever delivered in their most nice and boldest Disputes, and therefore at last when no tolerable account could be given of their meaning, from pure shame they disclaimed them. The Author of the Gloss on *Gratian*, when he comments on those words *handled, and broken by the hands of the Priests, &c.* tells us that *those words, if not understood in a right sence, will lead us into a greater Heresie than that of* Berengarius. *Lombard.* Sent. Lib. 4. dist. 12.

The next Council therefore under *Gregory* the Seventh waves such offensive terms, but yet decides the manner of Christs Presence in the Eucharist as plainly and openly, tho' not in such harsh Expressions. Nay they designed to explain the *Modus* as decisively as possibly they could, to oblige *Berengarius* to renounce a new way he had of explaining his opinion, which was (as *Surius* reports it) that Christ's Body is substantially present, but together with the substance of the Bread and the Wine, which remain in their Natures unchanged, which is the same with the Lutheran Consubstantiation. Now this clearly enough expresses the real Presence, and that the Bread and Wine were not mere Signs: and yet this would not do, nothing will serve, but he must declare his Belief of the Real Presence in that manner as they would be pleased to define it. And how that you may see it in the second form of Abjuration, forc'd on *Berengarius*, (which I have given before) which precisely determines the *Modus* of Christ's Body being present in the Eucharist to be by the change of the Elements into the true and proper Flesh and Blood of Christ. And it was because the Church of *Rome* had thus decreed it to be in this peculiar manner and no other, which made it be received; since many of the Schoolmen plainly avow, that they would rather have embraced Consubstantiation as more Rational, had not the Authority of the Church interposed in defining another manner of Christs substantial Presence. This *Occam* and *Petrus Aliacensis* freely profess: The later of which argues for Consubstantiation, as being less obnoxious to Objections and Absurdities, and easier to be conceived than Transubstantiation, which puts Accidents without a Subject, *&c.* And therefore he assigns the determination of the Church, as the only reason which sway'd him to assent to this later *Modus* of Christ's Real Presence rather than to the other, which yet he judged in it self to be more Rational.

Surius concil. Tom. 3.

Occam in lib. Quarto Sen. qu. 5.

Petrus de Alliaco in Quart. lib. sent. qu. 6. Art. 2.

And tho' these Councils did not make use of a hard word which was not invented, yet they as certainly assigned the manner of the thing, as if they had expressed it by Transubstantiation. But that the very Term as well as the Notion might be determined, *Innocent* the Third in a Council, which he assembled in the Lateran at *Rome* in 1215. confines this Article to this peculiar Expression, that those whom they called Hereticks might not, to avoid their Inquisition, conceal their true meaning under cover

Spondanus concin. Anali Baron. Tom. 1. ad Annum 1215.

of

of general ambiguous Terms. And no word was thought more capable of speaking the manner of the Conversion of the Elements into Christs Body and Blood after Consecration, than this, which says that the one are transubstantiated into the other. And therefore the Decree against the *Albigenses* is compiled in these words.

There is one universal Church of the Faithful, out of which none is saved. In which Jesus Christ the Priest is himself the Sacrifice, whose Body and Blood in the Sacrament of the Altar are truly contained under the Species of Bread and Wine, the Bread being transubstantiated into the Body, and the Wine into the Blood by the Divine Power, that to perfect the Mystery of our Union with him, we may receive that of his, which he assumed of ours. What more defining of the signification of the Word the Author of the *Reasons* expects in the Canon of a Council, I cannot imagin, unless he would have had the Fathers to shew themselves good Grammarians in critizing upon Etymologies. For in telling us *that the Body and Blood are truly contained under the Species or Accidents of Bread and Wine, the last being transubstantiated into the first*; they say enough to explain their Meaning to be, that the Substance of the Bread passeth into that of the Body of Christ, which the Council of *Constance* in 1415. clearly explains, when they condemn *Wickliff* as Heretical in his Faith concerning the Eucharist, because forsooth he asserted the *Substance of the Bread and Wine materially to remain in the Sacrament of the Altar, and that the Accidents of the Bread and Wine are not in the same Sacrament without their Subject.* Now this is a Philosophical Disquisition of the manner, which yet the Author says was never decided but in the Schools.

Decretal. Gregor. Lib. 1. de summ. Trinitat. & Fide Catholica. Tit. 1. c. 1.

Pag. 21.

Pag. 23.

The *Trent* Council is yet more expreſs in defining the *Modus* of the real Preſence to be by the Change of the whole Subſtance of the Bread into the Subſtance of the Body of Chriſt, which had ſufficiently determined Tranſubſtantiation, though they had not added the Word it ſelf, which means no more nor no leſs than they declare in this whole Sentence, and to prove the contrary, it will be neceſſary to derive that Word from ſome other Language then the Latin. But that nothing might be wanting to a full Deciſion, they appoint this Name Tranſubſtantiation to ſignifie this Converſion of one Subſtance into another, and ſo determine the manner of the thing, as well as explain the meaning of the Word. The Title of the fourth Chapter of their Thirteenth Seſſion, is of Tranſubſtantiation; and it is compoſed in theſe Expreſſions. *Becauſe Chriſt our Redeemer truly ſaid that to be his Body which he offered under the Species of Bread, therefore the Church of God always were perſwaded of this, and this holy Synod now at laſt declares, that by the Conſecration of the Bread and Wine, there is made a Converſion of the whole Subſtance of the Bread into the Subſtance of the Body of Chriſt our Lord, and of the whole Subſtance of the Wine, into the Subſtance of his Blood, which Converſion is conveniently and properly called by the holy Catholick Church, Tranſubſtantiation.* By which they appropriate the Word, as full and expreſſive to ſignifie the manner how the Body of Chriſt is really preſent in the Euchariſt. And for this reaſon it is objected againſt their Decree in Father *Paolo's* Hiſtory, that they contradicted themſelves. For in the firſt Chapter of this Seſſion they had ſaid of the manner of the real Preſence, yet it could not be expreſſed, and here they ſay that Tranſubſtantiation is a moſt proper and convenient Word, and ſo under-

Concil. Trid. Seſſ. 13. c. 4.

Hiſtoria del concilio Tridentino. Lib. 4

undertake to expreſs by it, what before they had ſaid was ineffable. But whoſe Fault is it, if the Council contradicts it ſelf? *Sforza Pallavicino* in the Hiſtory of the ſame Council, which he wrote to deſtroy, if he could, the eſtabliſhed Credit of this great celebrated Hiſtorian, endeavours to wipe off this Reproach from the Council: He, and this Author of the *Reaſons*, &c. from him, return this Anſwer unto the Objection; that though the ancient Fathers acknowledged the Proceſſion of the ſecond Perſon in the Trinity from the Father to be ineffable, and that the Union between God and the Humanity of Chriſt is ineffable, and yet made uſe of the words, eternal Generation, and hypoſtatical Union to expreſs them. Tis true, they did ſo, and yet in a conſiſtency with themſelves, which the Council of *Trent* is not. For this firſt tells us, that Chriſt is really and ſubſtantially preſent in the Euchariſt; but that how he is ſo, is inexplicable, and yet in the fourth Chapter, they undertake not only to explain the manner how Chriſts Body is really preſent under the Accidents of the Bread, which is by the Converſion of the Subſtance of this into that; but they choſe the Word Tranſubſtantiation as moſt accommodate to declare properly this *Modus* of the thing; whereas the ancient Church, becauſe ſhe knew, and had pronounced the Trinity, and the Union of the two Natures in Chriſt to be an ineffable Myſtery, never made any Inquiſition how they could be, nor indeed uſed thoſe words of eternal Generation, and hypoſtatical Union with any purpoſe, by them to expreſs the manner of the thing, which yet the *Trent* Council does, as to Tranſubſtantiation, and ſo contradicts its own Decree in the firſt Chapter of this thirteenth Seſſion.

Pallavicino. Hiſtoria del concili. di Trento. Part. 1. L. 12. c. 7. Pag. 985. Ed. Rom.

Pag. 26.

Seſſ. 13. c. 1.

And

And that the Design was particularly to determine the *Modus* of the Real Substantial Presence, to the exclusion of any other, appears from the Canons of the same Session: In the Second they pronounce an *Anathema*, who should explain the manner of the Presence by Consubstantiation, tho that salves the substantial and real Presence as well as any other; but to believe Christ to be really and substantially present in the Eucharist, was not enough to avoid the imputation of Heresie; if they do not fully assent to the manner how he is there by Transubstantiation, which they had decided, they are as perfectly curs'd as those in the first Canon, who affirm'd the Bread and Wine to be naked Signs of Christ's Body and his Blood. And then in the Third Canon they nicely and Philosophically dictate, how Christ's Body and Blood is contain'd under the *Species*, so as to be all under them single, and all in every part of them, which is as subtle a Disquisition as ever was made by the Schoolmen in any of their Disputes.

Conc. Trid. Sess. 13. can. 2.

Pag. 25. 'Tis granted indeed, what our Author would make so much of, That when the *Dominicans* and *Franciscans* fell into Philosophical Disputes, they would not be admitted: But their Disputes were not about the *Modus* of the Real Presence, which was already strongly confirm'd by the Churches Authority; and all agreed, that it was by Transubstantiation; but they disagreed, what *Hypothesis* would be best to make it look most plausible. The *Dominicans* were very earnest to have it, that the Substance of the Bread passed by an alteration into the Body of Christ. The *Franciscans* were very hot, that the Body of Christ was brought into the room of the removed Substance of the Bread, which civilly withdrew to give it place. The *Council*, which was always

ways very jealous of having its Decrees examin'd or diſcuſs'd by Reaſons, in this unintelligible Myſtery, was ſure to be moſt careful to avoid it; well knowing that Philoſophical Notions would but more confound them, and expoſe the Abſurdities, which could not be excus'd, or defended; and they very well knew that ſublime Nonſenſe is moſt obſcure, when wrapt in Clouds, and never becomes more intolerably nauſeous than by Endeavours to explain it.

And however the Schoolmen might wrangle about a hundred curious Queſtions concerning the Body of Chriſt in the Sacrament, yet they all agreed, that the manner of his being there, was by Tranſubſtantiation: This was Matter of Faith, in which they ſubmitted to the Churches Authority; and therefore this was laid as a common Principle conceded by all, though they differed in the manner of their Sophiſtical Talk about Matter and Form, and the Difference of Accidents from their Subjects, *&c.* And perhaps that which made the Philoſophy of *Ariſtotle* ſo acceptable, was, becauſe they found it would be moſt ſerviceable to Tranſubſtantiation. And therefore the *Carteſian* Philoſophy is forbid to be taught in the Schools, becauſe it denies that Accidents are Beings diſtinct from Subſtance; and upon theſe Principles they think Tranſubſtantiation not to be ſo well defenſible. And this is a known Objection which is made uſe of in the Diſputes againſt him, and which he and his Followers are ſo ſtudious to evade.

The Fourth and laſt thing which I come now to conſider, is, the boaſted Conſent of the Proteſtant Churches; wherein, ſays the Author of the *Reaſons*, *&c.* we ſhall find the ſame Harmony of the Faith, and Diſcord of Philoſophy as in the Church of *Rome*. P. 28.

But on the contrary, I ſhall evince, that the Proteſtants

ſtants never owned the ſame Faith of the Real and Subſtantial Preſence with that Church.

The firſt which he cites, is, the famous *Ausburgh* Confeſſion; wherein yet there is not the leaſt Syllable of the Subſtantial Preſence, but only an expreſs Aſſertion of the Real, which thoſe whom he calls *Zuinglians* and *Sacramentarians* will not deny in the Senſe which I have ſtated at the beginning of this Diſcourſe. But in the *Latin* Edition, the Author has foiſted in theſe Words, *are there preſent indeed:* whereas nothing more is expreſſed, than the Body and Blood of Chriſt are really exhibited; which all will ſubſcribe to. In the *German* Edition indeed it is worded, *they are truly preſent*: But if the Author had himſelf compos'd them, and put in all that he cites them to prove, yet how little evidence to the purpoſe would they even then give? For all Chriſtendom knows that the *Lutheran* Faith concerning Conſubſtantiation, is vaſtly diſtant from the Subſtantial Preſence, which I prov'd the *Roman* Church in her Councils to have determin'd; and as I have clear'd it by the Fourth Canon of the Thirteenth Seſſion at *Trent*, they are all adjudg'd to be accurs'd Heretics, though they ſpeak out Real and Subſtantial never ſo plain and often; if they do not learn to pronounce another hard Word, which our Author ſays neither can nor ought to be underſtood, and yet it is a Point of their Faith; ſo much is it for their Glory to believe they know not what. I will then grant him that in many of the Proteſtant Confeſſions, Chriſt is ſaid to be really and ſubſtantially preſent; and that *Melanchthon* in his Apology for that of *Auſburgh*, chuſes the very Word, out of a Zeal he had to compoſe the Quarrels of Religion, as far as he could without proſtituting Freedom of Conſciences,

Extat in corp. confeſſ. par. 2. p. 13.

Apud *Chytæum* Hiſt. *Aug. Confeſſ.* p. 83. & in. 4to. Tom Oper. *Luth.* Fol. 162. Ed. Germ.

Pag. 9.

and

and the innocence of his Mind. But the effect was very much different from what the good Man hop'd. He did not consider he had to do with a Church, who professeth it as an Honour due to her Infallibility, not to abate the least Punctilio's, which have once had the mark of her Authority. And therefore those of that Church, were so far from being courted into any condescension, by these Compliances and Overtures made for Peace, that they became the more haughty, and treated the Doctrine of the *Lutherans*, which asserted the Substantial Presence as an insufferable Heresy, because they would not express the manner of it to be by Transubstantiation. A clear Instance of it, is the confutation of the *Augustan* Confession, presented and read to the Emperor *Charles* V. and the Princes, wherein it is declared, That the Tenth Article in that Confession concerning the Real and Substantial Presence could not be admitted as satisfying, but with this necessary addition, that they believe the Church determining the Substance of the Bread to be changed into the Body of Christ in the Consecration of the Eucharist, as it was decreed by the General *Lateran* Council under *Innocent* the Third.

Apud Chytræum in Hist. August. Confess. pag. 179, 180.

That which farther manifests the same thing, is, that in all the Conferences of Religion, between those of the Roman Church, and the Reformers, they could never agree in this Article of the Eucharist, no more than in any other, but they always quarrel'd that the Protestants would not express the manner of this Substantial Presence, as the Romish Councils had deliver'd it.

It was this made the Issue of a General Diet so unsuccessful, which *Charles* V. conven'd at *Ratisbone* in 1541, with great zeal and earnestness, to make an accord between the Protestants and Catholicks: And he took all politick Measures to bring the two Parties to a condescending temper, that by Concessions on both sides, the Differences might be accommodated. He influenced the Pope's Legate, Cardinal *Contarini*, a

Man famous for Wisdom and Learning, and perswaded him, that for the Peace and Unity of the Church, he would manage things with a soft and yielding Spirit. The Cardinal was so moderate, as to smooth several Articles which sounded too harsh to the Protestants; and so to qualify the Terms, as to make them be more easily receiv'd.

* Paol. Soave Hist. del Concil. Trident. lib. 1. p. 103. Ed. 4.

† Pallavicino Historia del Concilio di Trent. part 1. lib. 11. cap. 13. p. 401.

* For this he incurr'd the Popes high Displeasure, † who had given him Instructions not to abate any thing, and if he saw the Emperour so urgent on him to make healing Concessions that he could not avoid it, he had orders instantly to leave the Diet, tho not the Court of the Emperour. But he mov'd more by his own natural Moderation, than the Instructions of the Court of *Rome*. And at the Emperour's desire review'd the Articles of Concord, which were presented to him by *Granvile* the great Favourite, and Minister of State. He carefully read them over, and corrected them to the mildest and most favourable Expressions. The writing thus form'd as they thought, so that both the contending Parties might agree to it: It was propos'd to the Assembly, where the Principal deputed to act on behalf of the Catholicks were *Eckius*, *Flugius*, and *Gropperus*, and the Protestants were *Melanthon*, *Bucer*, and *Pistorius*. The Conference at first succeeded very happily, they all consenting in these Articles: viz. *of Faith, of Works, of Bishops, and of Baptism*. But the first subject of Dissension, was (as *Pallavicini* tells us [*Pallav.* ibid. *p.* 407.] out of the Cardinal's own Letters) the great Controversy of the Eucharist. The *Lutherans*, as high Assertors as they were of the Real Presence, refus'd the word Transubstantiation. The Cardinal, tho so compliant in other Points, was in this firm and unmoveable, and refus'd to make the least alteration. And tho some counsell'd him to do it, and insinuated to him that it was a meer question about words; yet he had other thoughts, since he apprehended that the rejecting the word, would at last introduce

introduce the denial of the the thing ſignified by it. And thus after a Months debate the Conference was broken up, becauſe they could never be brought to a conſent in this Article.

Sleidanus Comment. lib. 14. p. 285. Ed. in Fol.

The ſecond Example I ſhall produce is the Conference, which was in appearance for the ſame deſign of Peace, aſſembled at *Poiſſy* in *France* in the Year 1561. with as little ſucceſs. There the great Debate was concerning the Real Preſence in the Sacrament, *Peter Martyr*, *Beza*, and *Marlorat* were the moſt conſiderable, who managed the Diſpute for the Proteſtants. And here *Beza* was ſo far from receding from the Confeſſion of their Faith, which four Years before he had preſented at *Worms*. (Tho the Author of the Reaſons, *&c.* accuſes him as guilty of a baſe Prevarication.) As on the contrary he freely and plainly profeſſeth *their Faith to be, that the Bread is the Communion of the Body, and the Wine of the Blood of Chriſt, which was ſhed for us, and that in the ſame ſubſtance, which he aſſum'd in the Womb of the Virgin*, but yet he renounces Tranſubſtantiation *as that which contradicts the Truth of Chriſt's humane Nature, and of his Aſcenſion into Heaven.* And when by the Queen Mother's Command the Bp of *Vallence*, and *Deſpentæus* for the Catholicks, and *Beza*, and *des Gallars* for the Proteſtants, conſulted together to find an Expedient to accord all Differences as to this Article, they all four of them at laſt conſented in this Formulary.

Pag. 53, 54.

We believe that in the uſe of the Lord's Supper, the true Body and Blood of Chriſt is truly, and really, and ſubſtantially, that is, in the Subſtance it ſelf, and in a ſpiritual and ineffable manner is exhibited and taken by the believing Communicants. Tho all this was high, and expreſſive enough of the reality of Chriſt's Preſence, yet it was not ſatisfactory; the Cardinal

Poplinier ibid. p. 274. & d' Aubigne part. 1. lib. 2. chap. 24.

ſpoke fiercely againſt it, engag'd the greateſt party of the Biſhops to decry it as inſufficient, and heretical, and they ſoon fram'd another contrary, which might import Tranſubſtantiation. And ſo this Conference was diſſolv'd with as little effect as the other, becauſe no other manner of Real Preſence would be admitted than that which is by the Tranſubſtantiation of the Bread into the Body of Chriſt.

Thus it fully appears, that tho theſe Expreſſions of real and ſubſtantial were neceſſarily to be underſtood in their ſtricteſt meaning, when ever us'd in the Confeſſions of Faith, or by *Melanchthon*, *Bucer*, *Beza*, &c. yet even by what the Catholicks themſelves have own'd, they do not ſignify what of their Church is the true Faith concerning Chriſt's Preſence in the Euchariſt, and ſo are in vain preſs'd by the Author for the Service he deſign'd them.

But the Invalidity of theſe Citations unto this purpoſe will enough demonſtrate it ſelf, if we do but examine the true ſenſe of theſe words, as they who make uſe of them explain what they meant. 'Tis true indeed that many of the Confeſſions, and among the reſt that of *Wittemberg* in 1536 ſay, *that the Body and Blood of Chriſt are truly and ſubſtantially exhibited.* But the latter word may be only energetical of the former, and ſignify no more than indeed and in truth, and moſt real Effects in oppoſition to meer Notion, and Phancy. For they thought they could not in two lovely terms expreſs how far off they were from the Opinion of the *German* Anabaptiſts, who would own the Euchariſt to be nothing more than a meer Sign and Memorial of Chriſt's Death, and to have no other Effect on us than to put us in mind of it. When therefore the true Orthodox Proteſtants would obviate

viate these Mistakes, they speak of Christ's Presence in the most amplifying Expressions, as if his Body in its natural Substance were present, and offer'd to us, when as they meant it only in the reality of Grace and Blessing. I will mention but one or two, who to this purpose explain their own sense of the words.

That formulary of Concord which was drawn out of the *Wittemberg* Confession, for the *Helvetian* Churches to subscribe, and was compos'd on purpose to soften the harsh sound of some Expressions in that Confession which were offensive. That form of Concord expresseth the Bread to be the Body of Christ only in respect of the Sacramental Union between them, which is the Relation between them as a Sign, and thing signified. And this is subscribed by *Luther*, *Melancthon*, *Myconius*, *Bucer*, and others. And so for the Saxon Confession which is cited by the Author of the Reasons, *&c.* the words immediately following which he hath omitted, express the substantial Presence of Christ by the happy Effects. *Christ testifies that he is in them (that is, in the worthy Receivers) and that he makes them Members to himself, and hath washed them with his own Blood.*

Extat apud Chytræum Hist. August. Confes. pag. 680.

Pag. 31, 32.

Ibid. p. 511. & Corpus Confess. par. 2. pag. 73.

And *Bucer* himself at his return to *Strasburgh* explaining to them the Formulary of Concord, explains that word substantially to mean no more than that there is a true Exhibition of Christ himself in the Sacrament.

To produce but one more, which is the Declaration that the Reformed Churches of *Poland* in an Assembly at *Thorns* made, that *as concerning the Sacrament of Christ's Body and Blood, they assented to the Faith of the Augustan and Bohemian Confessions, which express the substantial Presence.* But then in

In Corp. Confess. part. 2.

in their Special Declaration they explain how they understand it, that the Bread and Wine are truly, and are call'd so, the Body and Blood, not substantially, that is, not Corporally, but Sacramentally, and Mystically, and the Body and Blood of Christ they speak to be Christ, and his Benefits that are really exhibited and offer'd to us.

And now to come to our own Church of *England*, she expresses indeed the real Presence, as the Reformed Churches assert it, but not in the sense as, tis receiv'd in the Roman Church for an Article of Faith.

Reasons for abrogating &c. p. 47.

Nor does the Account which the best Historian of this Age gives of *Cranmer* from a Manuscript of the Learned Dr. *Stillingfleet*, make that Archbishop a Sacramentarian, as the Author angrily accuses him. For all that *Cranmer*'s Answer recorded in the Manuscript imports, is, only his renouncing a nonsensical Notion of Christ's being offer'd by the Priest as a real Sacrifice to God in the Mass.

To call in question the credit of the Manuscript it self, is to accuse the sincerity of that worthy Person to whom it is owing, and for any Man to question a Reputation so well establish'd, is to forfeit his own. And indeed, by the same reason as he would overthrow the Authority of this Writing, he may that of all Ancient Records in the World, whose Credit depends very much on the Integrity and Learning of him who first produceth them: How he would more have the Paper prov'd, and warranted, I cannot imagine, unless he would have the Man who wrote it, conjur'd from the Dead, to be the Authentick Witness. What certain Conveyance or Tradition do's he require, unless it is necessary to know the Names of all the Persons

P. 50.

from

from whom it hath been successively delivered. But to know whether a Writing be genuine, our Author has found out a new way on trials by examining its Genealogy, and whether it was lawfully begotten, and what were its great Ancestors. And that we may know hereafter what is the legal descent of a Writing in Manuscript, the Learned would be extreamly obliged to him, if he would but bless it with the discovery, how many Aps must precisely go to make up the gentile Pedegree of a Paper. But he is so mistrustful of being deceived, that he will believe nothing more than what he sees, which yet is very inconsistent with that Religion, of which he has so lately undertaken the defence.

But to return to the Argument, all that he brings to prove that the Real and Substantial Presence hath been the constant Doctrine of the Church of *England*, is as little convincing as all the former Instances he hath assign'd to prove the same of the Foreign Churches.

As for the form of words retain'd in the new Office of the Communion drawn by *Cranmer*, and the Form prescrib'd in the first Liturgy of *Edward* the Sixth, and that King's own Injunctions, they express no more than the rankest Sacramentarian would do. I am sure *Peter Martyr*, whom he dignifies with that Title, says as much an hundred times. P. 521.

As for the Alteration made in the fifth Year of that King's Reign, the Articles might be as well fram'd by *Cranmer* and *Ridley*, as by a private Cabal of *Dudleys*, or a Club of poor Laicks. It is a very improbable Calumny, for who can once imagine that a Parliament would ratify that by a Law, which if it had so mean and pitiful a descent as he insinuates, was unworthy the least notice P. 53.

tice of Authority, unleſs to puniſh the impudent Deceit.

P. 60. But in the beginning of Queen *Elizabeth*'s Reign, ſays our Author, all this was recall'd again; *And ever ſince that time, the moſt eminent Divines in the Church have ſucceſſively, from Age to Age, been the moſt zealous Aſſertors of the Real and Eſſential Preſence.* Ay, but not in the Roman Senſe, and therefore will never come over to his Side.

It would be endleſs to conſider particularly the ſeveral Authors he mentions. Moſt of them may be ſeen in the Hiſtory of Tranſubſtantiation written in Latin by the late and learned Biſhop of *Durham*, who cites them for a purpoſe very contrary to his. I will content my ſelf with retorting that Example upon himſelf, which he thinks is moſt ſtrong to ſupport his Aſſertion, and that is *Poinett* Biſhop of *Wincheſter*, whoſe Dialacticon was written in 1561, with a deſign of Peace, to reconcile, if poſſibly, all the Differences which this Controverſy of the Euchariſt hath created. He ſays indeed in that Diſcourſe that *the Euchariſt is not only the Figure of the Body of our Lord, but comprehends in it the Truth it ſelf, the Nature and Subſtance.* But he requires that we ſhould underſtand this in a ſpiritual Senſe, according to the common and agreeing Interpretation of the ancient Fathers; and what that was is well known, and therefore we cannot be ignorant what was this Learned Biſhop's Mind. I might in like manner ſhew, that tho the other learned Men of this Church, as Biſhop *Jewel*, *Bilſon*, *Andrews*, *Montague*, &c. may on this occaſion have expreſs'd themſelves in high and ample terms, yet it was in a different meaning than what the Author of the Reaſons would make us believe they own'd.

Coſmi Hiſt. Tranſubſt. c. 2.

Thus I have in Zeal for the Truth, which I could not ſee bleminſh'd with falſe Shadows without ſome Indignation, employed my poor Abilities to vindicate it. And now I pray God with all my Soul, that the Truth which I would love and value above all things, may not ſuffer any thing from the weakneſs of this Diſcourſe, and that thoſe Diſabilities, of which I am conſcious to my ſelf, may not prejudice the Cauſe which I have attempted to defend.

FINIS.

UMI